SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK 1 COUNTY OF NASSAU : CRIMINAL TERM PART 80 2 ----X 3 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, : Indictment : No. 2415N/084 -against-5 HAROLD GOPAUL, : Sex Abuse 1 6 : Huntley/Mapp Defendant. 7 April 30, 2009 8 252 Old Country Road 9 Mineola, New York 10 BEFORE: 1.1 HONORABLE JAMES P. McCORMACK, 12 Acting Supreme Court Justice 13 14 APPEARANCES: 15 HON. KATHLEEN M. RICE 16 Nassau County District Attorney For the People 17 BY: JAMIE JOHNSON, ESQ., Assistant District Attorney 18 of Counsel. 19 DONALD R. SCHECHTER, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant 20 80-02 Kew Gardens Road - Suite 1030 Kew Gardens, New York 11415 21 22 23 WENDY SILAS 24 Senior Court Reporter 25

Proceedings	
-------------	--

	Proceedings 2
_	
1	THE CLERK: Case is on for hearing, People of
2	the State of New York against Harold Gopaul,
3	Indictment 2415N of 2008.
4	Counsel?
5	MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon, Judge.
6	For the People, Jamie Johnson.
7	MR. SCHECHTER: On behalf of the defendant,
8	Harold Gopaul, Donald R. Schechter, 80-02 Kew Gardens
9	Road, Kew Gardens, New York.
10	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
11	This matter has been sent to me by
12	Judge Donnino for purposes of hearing and I think
13	ultimately trial.
14	I see that as a result of the decision by
15	Judge Calabrese this is a Mapp/Huntley Hearing?
16	MS. JOHNSON: Correct, Judge.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Schechter, that's your
18	understanding as well.
19	MR. SCHECHTER: Combined Mapp/Huntley, yes,
20	Judge.
21	THE COURT: All right, now, People you
22	indicate that you have some witnesses, police
23	personnel, from New York City?

25

the Huntley/Mapp issues involves two witnesses.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, Judge. The hearing for

Proceedings

The first is Detective Schulman of the NYPD, he is here today.

And, second, is a uniformed police officer, Officer Alfaro. She was unavailable for today. I do not anticipate, as it is now 3:15, finishing with Detective Schulman today.

I did step outside to speak with him. There are some issues with having NYPD officers come here on their days off. He does have child care issues tomorrow, your Honor. I asked him if he would be available, come tomorrow, for continuation. He said due to personal child care issues he would not be.

THE COURT: Who is this that we're referring to?

MS. JOHNSON: Detective Schulman, who is here today.

I did send a teletype already for tomorrow for the uniformed officer, so if we have to finish with Detective Schulman another day and go a little bit out of order and continue with the uniformed officer tomorrow, I anticipate being able to do that.

I have not heard anything from the 105 command that the uniform officer would be unable to come tomorrow. Last I heard she would be available and she has been teletyped for 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

4

1	THE COURT: So there's two witnesses for the
2	hearing?
3	MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Detective Schulman and a
5	MS. JOHNSON: Officer Alfaro.
6	THE COURT: And Schulman has an issue with
7	regard to child care tomorrow and the other officer ha
8	been teletyped to be here for tomorrow.
9	MS. JOHNSON: She's been teletyped for
10	9 o'clock tomorrow and I haven't we confirmed that
11	the 105 received the teletype. I haven't heard any
12	problems or conflicts and this was as of this morning.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MR. SCHECHTER: If it please the Court, ther
15	are a few issues I have of my own.
16	Firstly, I understand that counsel is
17	indicating that my client allegedly executed a consent
18	to search document.
19	I had made discovery application requesting
20	any and all such information and I never received
21	copies of consent to search whatsoever.
22	As a matter of fact, in the discovery
23	applications counsel claimed that the search was an
24	open view, did not claim in the discovery materials

that my client executed a consent to search.

Proceedings

If the Court will peruse the District

Attorney's answer, I think it's devoid of any mention

my client executed a consent to search form, unless I'm

mistaken.

That's the first initial issue, Judge.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: All right, how many consent forms are there?

MS. JOHNSON: Two, Judge, one with regard to searching of the residence and one with regard to searching of the vehicle.

So your Honor knows, today was the first time I had been provided that paperwork as it was with city detective's case jacket. So I did provide that in the Rosario material.

MR. SCHECHTER: I don't think, really, that's an issue for a Rosario matter, I think that's a discovery matter, so I respectfully --

THE COURT: Now that you have the consent form, is there some way in which you've been prejudiced by receiving it today as opposed to having received it at some other point?

MR. SCHECHTER: Certainly, your Honor.

That belies the People's bill of particulars.

I respectfully submit if the People, in the bill of

Proceedings

particulars, allege that the issue at this hearing is whether or not the officer acted and seized the information -- seized the alleged evidence in plain view, that was what was prepared for this hearing.

As a matter of fact, I submit that's the purpose of a bill of particulars; for the People to specify the particulars of the case that we are dealing with and that is how defense counsel prepares the case.

Now, on the eve of the hearing, for the first time, I am given these consent documents which I had absolutely no knowledge of from the District Attorney and I submit that she should be confined to the parameters of the four corners of her bill of particulars, which is what she sent me, which is that the issue here is whether or not the items seized by the officer, not this officer, another officer, a female officer who will be testifying, I guess, tomorrow, whether, in fact, that evidence was seized because it was in open view.

I direct your Honor's attention to counsel's bill of particulars and her response to discovery, namely Page 5.

THE COURT: Page 5 of what?

MR. SCHECHTER: Of affirmation in opposition to defendant's omnibus motion dated February 5, 2009.

ws

All counsel spoke about was her opposition to the motion because standing was not alleged.

Then she says on Page 6, "In the alternative, the People submit that the seizure of the physical evidence from the car without a search warrant was justified because the property was in plain view of the officers as follows: Police Officer Celica Alfaro observed the defendant's vehicle and inside said vehicle the officer observed the meat clever/knife and a massager. Police Officer Alfaro recovered said items from the vehicle."

There is absolutely no mention or no setting forth here that the basis that she is claiming the legality of the search is a signed consent to search. There's nothing in her pleadings to say that, Judge, and that's the purpose of a bill of particulars.

Does the Court have --

THE COURT: I have your -- I have the

People's response to the discovery demand, which I take

it there was another attorney prior to yourself,

Mr. Schechter?

MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, there was a prior attorney which made motions which were insufficient and I was given the right to make my own omnibus motions which I, in fact, did.

Proceedings

However, the response of the People replicates the same allocations concerning the bill of particulars as to the justification of the search.

THE COURT: All right, so, People, there was a search of the defendant's vehicle?

MR. SCHECHTER: And home.

MS. JOHNSON: There was a search of the vehicle and a search of the home, which I believe -- as to notice, I believe that counsel was provided them from the Queens District Attorney's Office, Judge, and I believe a copy of the property vouchers were turned over in discovery to both attorneys.

So I'm just looking for those now because I believe --

MR. SCHECHTER: No, never got the vouchers and I was never given a justification for the search with respect to this.

This is counsel's bill of particulars in Nassau County. Queens and Nassau are not contiguous. What the DA in Nassau -- in Queens does not bind with the District Attorney in Nassau.

MS. JOHNSON: Since we are prior to the trial and start of any hearing, we would make a motion to amend our bill of particulars orally and in our continuing duty to disclose any property or anything

under 240.20, we are not only relying upon the consent form, but we are also relying on the property that was recovered in plain view.

Obviously, you know, it's up to your Honor if counsel is going to be given the right to re-argue whether or not his client has standing, but, either way, we are prepared to litigate all aspects of not only the consent, but the plain view part of the search.

MR. SCHECHTER: People can't have it both ways, your Honor.

They said that they were ready. They claimed they were ready. They made this application telling the judge they are ready. As such, the bill of particulars becomes fixed.

There are time constraints on the defendant as well. The time constraints -- there are time constraints on the defendant as well.

THE COURT: I don't have your papers.

There's a lot of papers in front of me between your papers, the prior attorney's papers, the People's responses.

As to whether or not you had demanded copies of any consent searches --

MR. SCHECHTER: Any what?

1	THE COURT: Consent search forms?
2	MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, you're presuming
3	I would know about them.
4	It's part of their duty to provide me that in
5	discovery.
6	THE COURT: It gets back to my initial
7	question.
8	How are you and your client prejudiced at
9	this point since we're only conducting a pretrial
10	hearing with regard to these suppression issues?
11	MR. SCHECHTER: Because, your Honor, we are
12	required under the law to provide our motions within a
13	certain period of time and the People
14	THE COURT: I understand.
15	You've now been apprised of the consent
16	searches, the manner in which these searches were
17	conducted. You're now about to begin the hearings in
18	this matter.
19	Could you articulate to me as to how you
20	would be prejudiced or foreclosed from litigating the
21	issue as to whether or not your client validly executed
22	a consent to search for his vehicle or for his car?
23	What's the remedy?

24

25

MR. SCHECHTER: Preclude. I'm asking the

What are you asking me to do?

ws

Proceedings

Court to direct that the District Attorney proceed on the basis of plain view; that, in fact, that the theory that she proffered and the justification for the search proffered in her bill of particulars is what she's bound by.

That's the purpose of a bill of particulars.

Otherwise, it would render a bill of particulars

virtually meaningless and I ask that the People be held

to the proof that they claimed that they had, namely --

THE COURT: Could you show me your bill of particulars?

I am looking at your discovery demand, which didn't ask for any of the items you're claiming you want to have precluded now, or at least the consent searches.

MR. SCHECHTER: Let me get a copy of my demand, Judge.

Your Honor, the motions were made in response to the People's representations with respect to how the search occurred. They never, ever gave us any notice that there was a consent form, never in any of the VDFs, nothing.

THE COURT: All right, so you've gotten the hearing, you've now been apprised as to the manner in which the property was recovered.

ws

MR. SCHECHTER: And I'm respectfully asking that the Court make a determination.

THE COURT: Well, you first asked to have the items precluded.

Now it seems to be that you're acknowledging that you didn't ask for those items in your demand.

MR. SCHECHTER: Well, I'm asking for a hearing --

THE COURT: Now you're shifting your argument to, well, now, because they didn't mention it in their motion papers, that therefore they should be precluded as well?

MR. SCHECHTER: What I'm saying, your Honor, is the District Attorney, in their response to my motion papers, specified a theory, specified the basis, the justification, for the search. They did that.

They did that sua sponte.

As such, they proffered the theory that they were proceeding under and that is an open view theory, okay?

Now, right before we start the hearing, they say, "No, I'm changing the theory. Now I'm going to claim it was consensual."

I'm saying, of course, it's a surprise, but not only is it a surprise, they posited what they did

)

in a bill of particulars and I'm saying they're required to present the theory specified in the bill of particulars.

That's my application, judge.

THE COURT: All right, I'll reserve decision on your application at this time.

Anything else we need to address?

MR. SCHECHTER: Yes, Judge.

I've provided counsel with a list of forms that I noticed was not included in the Rosario material.

For example, there are prepared, to my understanding in the normal course of police arrests, documents that have not been provided and I will list them the same as I gave the District Attorney.

One is an activity log.

Two might be provided, I haven't had a chance to look through the documentation, is a complaint report. The document is PD 313-152. That's a complaint report.

The other document I did not receive is a New York State standardized domestic incident report with the form numbers DCJS 3221 and a report of suspected child abuse PD 377-1544.

He is a mandatory reporter. He was supposed

to make those -- do those documents.

His report to his patrol supervisor, I did not get that.

The domestic report incident log, I did not get that either.

Now, I don't know if there was an on-line booking system arrest work sheet, but, if there was, I'm entitled to that.

And, lastly - I have asked for this on several occasions and it has been granted because it's required - the commanding officer of the precinct, under certain circumstances, makes a request for a recommendation for commendation which contains within that request the statements and comments of the arresting officer as to the incidents.

I am requesting that a copy of that recommendation for a commendation, if such form exists.

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Johnson?

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, with regards to most of those documents that counsel had requested, a lot of it is not Rosario material for hearing purposes.

Let me start -- I mean, the complaint report is a narrative of the detective's conversation with the victim.

It has nothing to do with the defendant's

statement. It has nothing to do with any of the property. It has nothing to do with any conversations that a detective had with the defendant.

It's similar to our 32Bs here, except they don't do actual 32Bs in the city.

As to the domestic incident report, again, that is certainly Rosario for trial, but is not a written recorded statement about the detective's conversation with the defendant.

Same thing with the domestic report incident log, the report of suspected child abuse.

I have protective services reports here and I've gone through them. I'm happy to show your Honor what I have. Everything that is listed in this paperwork that is in the detective's case jacket is not about the substance of his testimony at this hearing.

What I've turned over is everything that the defendant (sic) has memorialized in regards to his contact with the defendant, his conversations with the defendant, nothing about his contact with the complainant as there is no Dunaway or probable cause aspect to the hearing.

But I'm happy -- if your Honor would like to review any of this in camera, I have it to review.

THE COURT: I'll take a look at the material

16

in camera, Mr. Schechter.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Whatever you want to explore for purposes of cross-examination as to these documents, as to whether or not they have some bearing or would be considered Rosario for purposes of the hearing, I'll certainly give you leeway to do that.

MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right, anything else?

MR. SCHECHTER: Well, I have no problem with the People beginning their direct examination, your Honor.

However, since, as -- it seems to be the law and the inclination of most prosecutors, I have just been given a pile of papers which are alleged to be Rosario material.

Therefore, I would like my cross-examination of the detective to be reserved for when I have an opportunity to peruse them, which would be, if not tomorrow, then I guess Monday.

MS. JOHNSON: Judge, considering the video is 20 minutes to a half hour, I don't think we're getting there anyway.

THE COURT: It will appear you'll get your request.

MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you, Judge.

MS. JOHNSON: There were two packets turned over to the Court and counsel, one with a Rosario cover sheet and the other one is the grand jury minutes of the detective, so I just want to make counsel acknowledges receipt of both of those.

MR. SCHECHTER: Let me hear this again, please?

MS. JOHNSON: Other than the packet, there was a separate packet that was the detective's Queens County grand jury testimony.

I want to make sure you got both of them.

MR. SCHECHTER: I have the grand jury testimony regarding -- part of what I was given was crossed out, so I don't know what that relates to.

So with respect to the grand jury testimony, absent what was contained that was crossed out on one of the -- on one, two, three -- three pages, I was given what appears to be the grand jury testimony from Queens.

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, what's crossed out is colloquy between a question from the grand jury and the Queens ADA. All the testimony is there.

So if your Honor would like to see what was redacted, I have that for the Court as well.

MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, I've been doing

this a long time. It's the first time I've ever seen colloquy in a grand jury redacted from grand jury minutes.

THE COURT: Can I ask you what we're talking about, because you people have been dealing with this case for the last umpteen months. I got it a half hour ago, so -- this is grand jury testimony of whom?

MS. JOHNSON: Detective Schulman.

THE COURT: In the Queens grand jury?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, Judge.

That is an original marked-out copy, so you can actually see through the black ink what was written It's on the last couple of pages.

(Shown to Court.)

THE COURT: And this is what pertains to the detective's interactions with the complainant?

MS. JOHNSON: No, it's not his testimony.

It's a question posed by the grand jury to the prosecutor which the prosecutor then asked. The actual part redacted is a grand juror's testimony.

THE COURT: In other words, it's colloquy between the DA in Queens and the grand juror? MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Schechter, that does seem to be the case.

23

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. SCHECHTER: I understand that, your

Honor. However, I respectfully submit,

notwithstanding that, I don't believe counsel has a

right to redact any part of those grand jury minutes,

regardless of what they are.

If it's colloquy, I'm entitled to look at it.

Maybe grand jury had a question with respect
to the officer's appearance, what the officer said or
what the law was. Maybe he or she was confused. There
are a lot of issues there that counsel is blocking me
from considering.

I have never -- when I was in the District Attorney's Office I gave the grand jury testimony. It's what they're entitled to. I never redacted anything unless it dealt with matters that were going to be dealt with on trial and then I would give them a separate grand jury minutes at trial containing the whole grand jury minutes, but I've never seen them redacted like that.

MS. JOHNSON: Judge, Judge Calabrese already reviewed the minutes, indicated that portions were not to be disclosed to defense attorney.

As the prosecutor, I have an obligation to keep those matters secret that are not Rosario and that's exactly what I've done.

	Schulman - People - direct 20
1	MR. SCHECHTER: I don't recall such a
2	direction from Judge Calabrese. Certainly, it wasn't
. 3	reduced to a writing.
4	THE COURT: Well, it doesn't appear,
5	Mr. Schechter, to be it's certainly not statements
б	made by any witness that would testify in this case.
7	It's clearly between a grand juror and the DA
8	who, I assume, is Mr. Rosenblatt?
9	MR. SCHECHTER: Yes.
10	MS. JOHNSON: Yes, Judge.
11	THE COURT: So I don't see any reason at this
12	time to unredact it, if you will, so I'm going to leave
13	it as such over your objection.
14	MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you, Judge.
15	All right, People, you want to call your
16	first witness?
17	MS. JOHNSON: Yes. Detective Leonard
18	Schulman.
19	LEONARD SHULMAN, a witness called on behalf of
20	the People, having been first duly sworn by the clerk
21	of the Court, was examined and testified under oath as
22	follows:
23	COURT OFFICER: For the record, state your
24	name, spell your last name, shield number, rank and
25	command?

Schulman - People - direct

21

THE WITNESS: Detective Leonard Schulman, 1 last name is, S-c-h-u-l-m-a-n, Shield 6387, assigned to 2 the 105 Precinct detective squad in Queens, New York of 3 4. the New York City Police Department. DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 MS. JOHNSON: 6 Good afternoon, detective. 7 0. Α. Good afternoon. 8 9 Detective, how long have you been employed by the 10 New York City Police Department? About 15 and a half years. 11 Α. 12 Q. How long have you been a detective? 13 Α. Almost ten years. 14 Q. Can you take us through the assignments that 15 you've worked at through your -- the course of your career? 16 Α. Obviously, initially the Police Academy. 17 From there I was assigned as a patrol officer in the 105 Precinct in Queens, New York. I was then assigned 18 19 to the -- a citywide anti-crime unit for about five years and for the last seven years I've been assigned as a 20 21 detective in the 105 Precinct detective squad. 22 Q. What area of Queens County does the 105 cover? 23 It's southeast Queens. It covers many different 24 communities. It ranges all the way from the Queens side of Floral Park, all the way down to Rosedale. 25

	Schulman - People - direct 22
1	Q. I'm going to direct your attention to June 23rd
2	into the 4th of 2008.
3	Were you working on that day?
4	A. Yes, I was.
5	Q. Were you working as a detective in the 105?
6	A. Yes, I was.
7	Q. What was your tour of duty that day?
8	A. I believe I was probably working a 4:30 p.m. from
9	the night of the 23rd to 1 o'clock in the morning the
10	morning of the 24th.
11	MR. SCHECHTER: Objection. Not probably, I
12	would like to know what the officer's tour of duty was,
13	Judge.
14	THE COURT: All right, detective, is that
15	your recollection as to
16	THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
18	MR. SCHECHTER: Is this June 23rd?
19	THE COURT: Yes, into the early morning of
20	June 24th.
21	MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, did I hear the
22	hours.
23	I'm sorry.
24	THE COURT: 4:30 p.m. on the 23rd to 1 a.m.
25	the morning of the 24th.

	Schulman - People - direct 23
1	Q. On June 23rd, 2008 during the course of your tour
2	did there come a time when an investigation was assigned to
3	you?
4	A. There did. I believe it was actually probably
5	about 12:30 in the morning of the morning of the 24th.
6	MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, once again, if
7	the officer says approximately I have no problem, but
8	when he says probably, then he's guessing.
9	THE COURT: All right, let me make the
10	following suggestion.
11	Detective, I notice you're looking at some
12	paperwork that's there.
13	Do you need to look at that to refresh your
14	recollection?
15	THE WITNESS: Only on a couple of minor
16	things. I mean, we're talking almost a year ago.
17	THE COURT: If you're going to look at any
18	paperwork, whether it's the DA or defense counsel,
19	indicate you need to look at it and what it is you're
20	looking at.
21	MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor
22	THE WITNESS: All right.
23	MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, I respectfully
24	ask the officer be asked if he has to refresh his
25	recollection then, if he does, we know he's testifying

Schulman - People - direct 24 from a refreshed recollection. 1 2 THE COURT: I'll let you and Ms. Johnson figure out how you're going to ask that. 3 Go ahead, Ms. Johnson, do you want to re-ask 4 that? 5 6 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. 7 On June 23rd, 2008, during the course of your 8 tour, did there come a time that you received an assignment? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. And what was the nature of the investigation that you were assigned to on June 23rd of 2008? 11 12 On the early morning hours of the 24th, where I was still on duty from my tour, I was notified that there 13 14 was a complainant in the 105 Precinct that was alleging that she was a victim of a crime involving her stepfather as a 15 16 perpetrator and that it was of a sexual nature and that both 17 that complainant and ACS were involved in the case and that an investigator was being asked to assist in the interviews. 18 19 THE COURT: Please lower the window? 20 Thank you. What was the name, not of the victim, of the 21 0. subject of the investigation? 22 23 Α. I learned that the subject in the investigation's 24 name was Harold Gopaul. 25 Can you tell us the circumstances of your first Q.

Schulman - People - direct

encounter with Harold Gopaul?

- A. I was advised by a Sergeant O'Hagan of the 105 Precinct, the desk officer, that he told me that Mr. Gopaul had come into the precinct and based on -- Sergeant O'Hagan said to me based on his knowledge of this particular case, that he recognized that Mr. Gopaul was the subject of the investigation and he initiated to have Mr. Gopaul taken into custody and arrested downstairs in the precinct.
- Q. When were you advised Mr. Gopaul came into the 105 Precinct?
- A. About 4:45 in the morning on the morning of the 24th.
- Q. What were you doing at approximately 4:45 in the morning on June 24th?
 - A. I was still speaking to the victim, Sana Awan.

 THE COURT: All right, let me just step back for a minute.

Go back to you said Officer O'Hagan --

THE WITNESS: Sergeant O'Hagan.

THE COURT: Sergeant O'Hagan.

He's a sergeant where?

THE WITNESS: The 105 Precinct.

THE COURT: Which is your precinct?

THE WITNESS: Yes. My office is upstairs on

25

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ws

Schulman - People - direct 26 the second floor and the patrol desk is on the first 1 floor. 2 THE COURT: And he tells you that the 3 defendant has come in to indicate that he is engaged in 4 what? 5 Can you give us the time when this happens, 6 the date? 7 THE WITNESS: I'm -- I think I understand 8 you're question. 9 Sergeant O'Hagan --10 11 THE COURT: Just so you understand, I'm 12 trying to get a time context of when -- you say that 13 you get notified in the early morning hours of an 14 assignment concerning a possible investigation of sexual abuse. 15 16 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 17 THE COURT: And that comes from O'Hagan? 18 THE WITNESS: I get a call from a detective 19 at the detective bureau, Queens, alerting me there was 20 a situation downstairs in the precinct. 21 THE COURT: In your own precinct? 22 THE WITNESS: In my precinct. 23 I then contacted the sergeant downstairs who 24 provided me with some additional information and 25 enabled me to then be able to speak to the victim and

Schulman - People - direct 27 the ACS worker that was in the building interviewing 1 the complainant. 2 3 THE COURT: Now, the victim in the building at the time? 4 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. 6 THE COURT: And where is the defendant at that time? 7 8 THE WITNESS: When I'm alerted? He's not in the building. He comes in a few 9 10 hours later on his own and he walks into the precinct 11 and says who he is and that he's there looking for his 12 daughter. 13 THE COURT: Okay, go ahead. 14 And do you learn this information from Sergeant -15 from the sergeant? 16 A. Yes, I do. 17 Ο. And what's his last name? 18 O'Hagan. Α. 19 Where -- are you still with the victim when you 20 actually hear this information from Sergeant O'Hagan? 21 I had stepped out from speaking to the victim. I Α. was alerted that the sergeant had something to tell me. 22 23 I came out of interviewing the victim and I had a 24 conversation that Mr. Gopaul had come into the precinct 25 wearing an Ecolab uniform, which is the company he, at the

Schulman - People - direct

time, we were told, he worked for. Sergeant O'Hagan had indicated that he had been informed of that information earlier so when he saw the Ecolab uniform and Mr. Gopaul came in and said whatever he said, that they recognized that he was going to be the subject in regards to the investigation that was going on at that moment.

- Q. Did you learn from the sergeant what it was that the -- that Harold Gopaul was coming to the precinct for?
- A. Sergeant O'Hagan told me that -- based on what he was telling me, that Mr. Gopaul was coming in and he was looking to report his daughter Sana Awan missing, that he didn't know where she was, and at that point in time once they knew who he was they had -- they took him into custody and arrested him.
- Q. And do you see the person you referred to as Harold Gopaul in the courtroom?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Can you point to that person and identify an item of clothing that they're wearing?
- A. A dark-skinned male wearing, it looks like, possibly a blue striped suit with a red, blue-and-white-type tie at the table.

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, let the record indicate the witness has identified the defendant.

THE COURT: Yes.

Schulman - People - direct 29

- Q. Where was the defendant when you came into your first contact with him?
- A. He was in an interview room in my office where I had instructed one of the uniformed officers to bring him so I can speak to him.
- Q. Can you describe for us what that interview room looks like?
- A. It's -- there's a door leading into a room and the room is probably ten by eight. I would speculate as to the measurements, without never having measured it myself.

When you first walk in there is a chair in front of you, there's a table that's maybe two by three feet in front of the chair and then there's another chair on the other side of the table.

THE COURT: All right, what time,
approximately when you meet him for the first time?

THE WITNESS: It's about 5:10 in the morning.

THE COURT: And this is in the -
THE WITNESS: Morning of June 24th.

THE COURT: In an interview room in the 105 Squad.

THE WITNESS: That's correct, Judge.

- Q. Are there any windows in that interview room?
- A. There's a small window on the door, maybe 14 by 14 or 12 by 12 right, you know, like eye level on the door.

Schulman - People - direct 30 Who was in the room with the defendant when you 1 Q. first got there? 2 He was in there by himself. And the door had been 3 Α. secured from the outside and I opened the door and walked 4 5 in. 6 Who was outside of the door? Q. 7 I don't recall specifically. I don't want to speculate. It would have been whoever the sergeant had sent 8 9 Mr. Gopaul up with. 10 MR. SCHECHTER: Objection as to what was 11 probable. 12 THE COURT: Yes, don't guess. If you don't 13 know just tell us. THE WITNESS: Yes, I don't know specifically. 14 Was it a police officer or civilian? 15 Q. 16 Α. Police officer. 17 What was the defendant doing inside that room when Q. you first entered? 18 19 Α. He was sitting in a chair at a table. 20 Was he handcuffed? Q. 21 Α. No. 22 Where were his handcuffs, if you know? Q. 23 Α. Pardon me? 24 Where were his handcuffs if you know? Q. 25 Α. I don't know.

	Schulman - People - direct 31
1	Q. Where was your gun when you entered the room?
2	A. It was locked up outside in my office.
3	Q. When had you locked your gun up?
4	A. When I was first apprised that Mr. Gopaul had been
5	taken into custody and was going to be brought up to be
6	interviewed in my office.
7	Q. Was the defendant sitting or standing when you
8	came when you went into the interview room?
9	A. Sitting.
10	Q. Was he sleeping?
11	A. No.
12	MR. SCHECHTER: Objection to the leading.
13	Q. What was he doing?
L4	A. He was awake and conscious and he was just sitting
L5	at the table.
16	Q. Where did you go upon entering the interview room?
L7	A. I sat at the first chair on the opposite side of
18	the table of Mr. Gopaul facing him.
L9	THE COURT: Okay, let me just interrupt you.
20	Could I just see both counsel?
21	(Discussion held at the bench, off the
22	record.)
23	(Pause in the proceedings.)
24	THE COURT: All right, Ms. Johnson, whenever
25	you're ready.
1	

Schulman - People - direct

- Q. What did you say to defendant when you entered the interview room?
- A. I introduced myself, something to the effect of,
 "I'm Detective Schulman. I'm conducting an investigation.

 Before I can speak to you about the investigation I need to
 read you what's called Miranda warnings before I can proceed
 with having any other conversation with you."
- Q. What was the defendant's response to you, if any response?
- A. I don't know initially that he said anything. I think he might have just nodded his head in an okay-type motion.

I then went on to -- you know, I had a pre-printed Miranda warning form that I went on to -- you know, I explained to him, "I'm going to read you these questions. I need a clear and concise answer, yes or no, if you understand what I'm reading to you."

He said okay.

I read him the first question of the Miranda warning.

Mr. Gopaul acknowledged that his answer was yes, that he understood.

I proceeded -- I mean, should -- I proceeded likewise for all six questions on the Miranda form and Mr. Gopaul's responses to each question was yes, he

	Schulman - People - direct 33
1	un der stood.
2	Q. What language were you having this conversation
3	in?
4	A. In English.
5	Q. And what language were the defendant's responses
6	in?
7	A. In English.
8	MS. JOHNSON: I'm going to ask that this be
9	marked as People's Exhibit Number 1 for identification,
10	please?
11	THE COURT: People's 1.
12	(People's Exhibit 1 marked for
13	identification.)
14	MS. JOHNSON: May I have that shown to the
15	witness, please?
16	(Shown to witness.)
17	Q. Detective Schulman, if you could take a look at
18	People's 1 for identification?
19	Do you recognize that document?
20	A. Yes, I do.
21	Q. What do you recognize that to be?
22	A. It's a photocopy of the Miranda warning sheet that
23	was used and read to Mr. Gopaul and prepared on the morning
24	of June 24th of 2008.
25	Q. How is it that you know that it was the form that

	Schulman - People - direct 34
1	was prepared with regards to this case?
2	A. The spots on the form that were prepared by me are
3	in my handwriting. I was present when Mr. Gopaul signed it
4	and I affixed my own signature as well.
5	Q. Is that a fair and accurate copy of the original?
6	A. Yes, it is.
7	MR. SCHECHTER: May I have a voir dire?
8	THE COURT: Well, could you wait until she
9	offers it?
LO	MR. SCHECHTER: Yes, Judge.
11	MS. JOHNSON: I would now offer what's been
L2	marked as People's 1 for identification into evidence
13 .	for purposes of the hearing.
L4	THE COURT: You want a voir dire,
15	Mr. Schechter?
16	MR. SCHECHTER: Yes, Judge. I jumped the gun
L7	a little bit.
L8	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. SCHECHTER:
20	Q. Detective Schulman, where is the original of this
21	document?
22	A. In my case folder.
23	Q. May I see it, please?
24	THE COURT: Yeah, if you have it.
25	THE WITNESS: Should I leave it in the folder

Schulman - People - direct - 35 or take it out? 1 2 THE COURT: Can you take it out without 3 having papers fly all over the place? THE WITNESS: I'll do my best. 4 5 (Shown to counsel.) 6 Q. Now, officer, how many of these documents do you have with you when you go into the room to speak to an 7 8 accused? 9 Α. Just one. 10 0. And when -- where did this document come from? 11 Α. Can you be more specific? 12 Q. Yes, where did you get this document from? 13 Α. There's a file drawer in my office where there is 14 assorted documents that we might need on any given day. 15 Q. And all those documents are the same? 16 Α. Depending which drawer you look at. 17 All the Miranda warning documents are the same? Ο. 18 Α. To my knowledge, yes. 19 They're in your drawer, correct? Q. 20 Α. Pardon me? 21 Q. They're in your drawer? It's not my drawer, it's an office drawer. 22 Α. 23 Q. Office drawer, I see. 24 When you took this document out, was this document 25 blank or did it have any writing on it?

	Schulman - People - direct 36
1	A. It was blank.
2	Q. And who put the notation of 0510 on the top right
3	of the document?
4	A. When I sat down with Mr. Gopaul I did.
5	Q. So that wasn't there when you got the document?
6	A. No.
7	Q. Were there anything was there anything else
8	written on this document when you came into the room?
9	A. Other than the typed pre-printed information, no.
10	MR. SCHECHTER: Judge, I'm finished with voir
11	dire.
L2	THE COURT: Okay, any objection?
13	MR. SCHECHTER: Not for purposes of the
14	hearing.
15	THE COURT: All right, People's 1 to be
16	received in evidence.
17	(People's Exhibit 1 received in evidence.)
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION CONT'D
19	BY MS. JOHNSON:
20	Q. Detective Schulman, can you please read for us how
21	you read the defendant his Miranda warnings on June 24th,
22	2008?
23	A. Well, as I was just describing, I initially wrote
24	0510 as to note the time that I was starting to read them.
25	I then said, "You have the right to remain silent

Schulman - People - direct 37 1 and refuse to answer questions. Do you understand?" 2 Mr. Gopaul clearly stated yes, that he understood. "Anything you do say may be used against you in a 3 4 court of law. Do you understand?" 5 Mr. Gopaul replied yes. "You have the right to consult an attorney before 6 7 speaking to the police and to have an attorney present 8 during any questioning, now or in the future. Do you 9 understand?" 10 Mr. Gopaul responded yes. 11 If I could just backtrack, as Mr. Gopaul was responding yes to each question I was writing his answer 12 13 down at each line before I proceeded to the next question. 14 THE COURT: So the yes that appears after 15 each question is your handwriting? 16 THE WITNESS: That is correct. 17 And whose initials appear next to yes? Q. 18 Α. Mr. Gopaul's. 19 And who wrote those initials down? Q. 20 Α. Mr. Gopaul, after the complete -- should I 21 continue reading all six questions or no? 22 Q. Yes, please. 23 As I was saying, I read Question 1. I asked, "Do 24 you understand?" 25 Mr. Gopaul replied yes. I wrote yes in my

	Schulman - People - direct 38
1	handwriting.
2	I read Question 2 and, again, after he responded
3	yes I wrote yes.
4	And I think I was up to Question 4, is that
5	accurate?
6	Q. Yes.
7	A. Okay, "If you cannot afford an attorney one will
8	be provided for you without cost. Do you understand?"
9	Mr. Gopaul replied yes. I wrote the answer yes.
10	"If you do not have an attorney available you have
11	the right to remain silent until you have had an opportunity
12	to consult with one. Do you understand?"
13	Mr. Gopaul responded yes. I wrote the answer yes
14	"Now that I have advised you of your writes are
15	you willing to answer questions?"
16	Mr. Gopaul answered yes and I wrote the answer
17	yes.
18	Q. And after you marked yes who was it that initialed
19	after each question?
20	A. Well, I then said to Mr. Gopaul, "I would like you
21	to read each question yourself, make sure you understand
22	what I read to you and affirm that the yes answers you gave
23	to me are still your answers to these questions."
24	Q. Did you hand him the piece of paper?
25	A. I handed him the piece of paper, took it and

Schulman - People - direct

looked at it, read each question and he said to me that, "My yes answers to each question are still correct."

I asked Mr. Gopaul, "If you would, please place your initials next to each yes answer you responded to me and also if you would print and sign your name on the lower portion of the form to indicate that you understand these rights."

He did, he did in each place, printed and signed his name on the back, handed it back.

I signed and affixed my shield number and then I wrote the date and time that was complete.

- Q. And is that the June 24th 2008 at 5:15 a.m.?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. Were any threats made to the defendant prior to him signing that Miranda warning sheet?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Were any promises made to him?
- A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Where was your gun while those Miranda warnings were issued?
 - A. It was locked up outside in my office.
- Q. At any time during the issuance of these Miranda warnings did defendant ask to speak to an attorney?
 - A. No.
 - Q. At any time during the issuance of these Miranda

	Schulman - People - direct 40
1	warnings did defendant indicate he no longer wished to speak
2	to you?
3	A. No, he did not.
4	Q. Was the defendant cooperative with you?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Did you actually did you personally observe him
7	sign and print his name where it's marked defendant?
. 8	A. Yes, I did.
9	Q. Did he ever ask did he ever indicate to you he
10	had any questions for you?
11	A. No, he did not.
12	Q. After the defendant signed the Miranda warning
13	form what did you do next?
14	THE WITNESS: I'm just going to refer to my
15	notes so I have the correct order of the next form.
16	THE COURT: Do you need to look at them to
17	refresh your recollection?
18	THE WITNESS: I do, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Could you please indicate what
20	you're referring to?
21	THE WITNESS: Absolutely, your Honor.
22	Okay, I'm referring to a complaint follow-up
23	report that I prepared.
24	THE COURT: Does it got a number?
25	THE WITNESS: It's labeled follow-up

	Schulman - People - direct 41
1	Number 3.
2	THE COURT: Do you have that, Mr. Schechter?
3	MR. SCHECHTER: As I said, your Honor, I was
4	just given these documents and I have not had a chance
5	to review them.
6	If counsel could refer them to me, then it
7	certainly will be helpful.
8	Q. Detective Schulman, are you referring to the
9	complaint follow-up informational report unapproved under
10	summary of investigation?
11	A. I'm referring to an approved copy.
12	Q. With a summary of investigation, Paragraph 1, on
13	June 24th, 2008 at approximately 4:45 hours?
14	A. That would be the report that I'm referring to.
15	MS. JOHNSON: That would be in the Rosario
16	material.
17	MR. SCHECHTER: I don't believe I have it,
18	Judge.
19	MS. JOHNSON: Page
20	MR. SCHECHTER: Can I see the report please?
21	MS. JOHNSON: Sure.
22	(Shown to counsel.)
23	MR. SCHECHTER: I don't have that. At least
24	I don't see it.
25	If I could be given just one minute?

Schulman - People - direct 42 I don't want to speak out of turn. 1 Α. MS. JOHNSON: It's towards the end. 2 (Pause in the proceedings.) 3 THE WITNESS: Is it okay if I leave this 4 here? 5 6 THE COURT: Yes. Okay, Ms. Johnson, did you have a question? 7 MS. JOHNSON: Can I continue? 8 9 THE COURT: Yes. Detective Schulman, what happened after you issued 10 Ο. 11 the Miranda warnings to the defendant and he signed them? 12 MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, I'm a little 13 confused. Counsel asked the officer a question about 14 the complaint follow-up report and she said it's marked 15 unapproved and the officer answered that, no, it's approved. I only got an unapproved copy so I don't 16 17 know what the officer is referring to here. 18 THE COURT: All right. 19 THE WITNESS: Can I explain why that is, your 20 Honor? 21 THE COURT: Yeah, could you? 22 THE WITNESS: And it's based on my 23 understanding. The computer system that the Police 24 Department was using at the time allows for us to, 25 using the computer program, type our complaint

	Schulman - People - direct 43
1	follow-up reports and then they're submitted to the
2	supervisor for approval.
3	After the supervisor approves it it no longer
4	shows the unapproved marking on it.
5	So I have the completed version which is
6	going to be consistent with the unapproved one with the
7	exception of the unapproved no longer appears.
8	THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Is it
9	identical of the unapproved one.
10	MR. SCHECHTER: I don't have a copy of the -
11	THE COURT: Mr. Schechter, would you mind if
12	I got some answers before you start interrupting me?
13	MR. SCHECHTER: I'm sorry and I do apologize
14	THE COURT: Would it be identical to the
15	unapproved?
16	THE WITNESS: The unapproved would no longer
17	appear and the supervisor that approved this
18	information would then be tagged in.
19	THE COURT: People, what I'm going to direct
20	you to do is whatever he's referring to, make a copy o
21	it before Mr. Schechter cross-examines the detective.
22	MS. JOHNSON: That's fine, your Honor.
23	MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you, your Honor.
24	Q. Detective Schulman, is the summary of the
25	investigation in the unapproved the same as that of the

Schulman - People - direct 44 approved? 1 2 Α. It is. And is that what you're refreshing your 3 recollection with, the summary of the investigation? 4 5 Α. Yes. 6 Can you now tell us what happened after the defendant signed that Miranda form? 7 Okay, I then stated to Mr. Gopaul that before I 8 could proceed that I would like to gather his consent to 9 10 search his work vehicle that he was in possession of and his 11 home. 12 I said, "In order for me to do that I'm going to 13 read to you a consent form that I have in order to get your 14 permission." 15 I then -- you know, while I was sitting in front 16 of Mr. Gopaul I wrote his name in the blank on the consent search of the home form and I wrote in the home address and 17 18 who he would be authorizing if he consented to this search. 19 I then --20 I'm sorry, just to interrupt you there, was this 21 still all going on in the interview room? 22 A. Yes. Had anybody else come into the room at this point? 23 Ο. 24 Α. No, they had not. 25 Q. Was defendant still unhandcuffed?

	Schulman - People - direct 45
1	A. Yes, he was.
2	Q. Were you still at the same desk with him?
3	A. Yes, I was.
4	Q. And was your weapon still secured?
5.	A. Yes, it was.
6	Q. At that point had the defendant indicated he no
7	longer wished to speak to you?
8	A. No, he had not.
9	Q. Did he ask any questions of you?
10	A. No, he had not.
11	Q. Did he ask to speak to an attorney?
12	A. No, he had not.
13	MS. JOHNSON: I'm going to ask that this be
14	marked as People's Exhibit Number 2 for identification
15	(People's Exhibit 2 marked for
16	identification.)
17	(Shown to witness.)
18	MS. JOHNSON: If I could have that shown to
19	the witness, please?
20	THE COURT: He's got it.
21	Q. Detective, if you could take a look at People's 2
22	for identification?
23	Do you recognize that?
24	A. Yes, I do.
25	Q. What do you recognize that to be?

Schulman - People - direct

- A. It is a photocopy of the consent search pre-printed form that I had filled in a couple of blanks and then read to Mr. Gopaul, to which he had given his consent to search his home.
- Q. Is that the form you were just referring to prior to me marking that for identification purposes?
 - A. Yes, it is.

- Q. And can you explain to us what the conversation was with the defendant prior to him signing this consent form?
- A. I read to Mr. Gopaul the substance of the form which at that point, after I had filled in a couple of blanks, "That I, Harold Gopaul, having been requested to consent to a search of my home located at 242-10 89th Avenue, Bellerose, New York, 11426, and having been duly advised of my Constitutional rights to, A, refuse such consent; B, to require that a search warrant be obtained prior to any search; C, that if I do consent to a search, any evidence found as a result of such search can and will be used against me in any civil or criminal proceedings; D, that I may consult with an attorney of my choosing before or during the search; and, that, E, I may withdraw my consent to a search at any time prior to its conclusion.

I then read, "After having been advised of my Constitutional rights I hereby knowingly, intelligently and

	Schulman - People - direct 47
1	voluntarily waive my above rights and consent to search. I
2	authorize Detective Schulman or authorized representative o
3	the NYPD to conduct a complete search of the above-describe
4	location, premise, residence/location apartment."
5	Q. And is People's 2 for identification a fair and
6	accurate copy of the form you read to the defendant?
7	A. Yes, it is.
8	MS. JOHNSON: Your honor, I would ask that
9	for hearing purposes People's Exhibit 2 be marked into
10	evidence.
11	MR. SCHECHTER: May I see the original
12	document, your Honor, before?
13	THE COURT: Yes.
14	MR. SCHECHTER: It might obviate the
15	necessity for voir dire.
16	(Shown to counsel.)
L7	THE COURT: Any objection?
18	MR. SCHECHTER: Not for the purposes of the
L9	hearing, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: All right, so without objection
21	for the hearing, People's 2 will be received in
22	evidence.
3	(People's Exhibit 2 received in evidence.)
24	(Shown to witness.)
25	Q. Detective Schulman, what you just read to us, was

48 Schulman - People - direct that how you read it to the detective in the interview room? 1 Yes, it was. 2 And what was his response to you reading that 3 Q. consent search form? 4 Α. Mr. Gopaul stated yes, he would consent. 5 I then said to him, "Well, again, I would like to 6 7 you read this to yourself." He read it to himself and then he signed his name 8 9 and he put the date and time and our location on the bottom 10 of the form and handed it back to me. 11 Did you observe the defendant put his signature on Q. that form? 12 13 Α. Yes, I did. 14 Q. And who was it that actually wrote the location, the date and the time? 15 16 Α. Mr. Gopaul. 17 And by that are you indicating that the defendant 18 wrote 5:20 a.m., June 24th, 2008, 105 detective squad? 19 Α. Yes, I am. 20 Q. Did you observe him read this form? 21 Α. Yes, I did. 22 Q. Did he have any questions for you after reading 23 it? 24 He did not. Α. 25 Q. Did he ask to speak to an attorney after he read

	Schulman - People - direct 49
1	it and before he signed it?
2	A. He did not.
3	Q. Were any threats made to him prior to signing it?
4	A. No, there were not.
5	Q. Were any promises made?
6	A. No.
7	Q. Had anybody entered or left the room during the
8	time this consent form was read to the defendant?
9	A. No.
LO	Q. And where was your weapon at that point?
L1	A. It was still locked up outside in my office.
L2	Q. Following the defendant's signing this consent
13	form marked as People's 2, what was the next conversation
L4	you had with the defendant?
15	A. Well, after he signed it I signed it and then the
16	next thing I did is I said to him that, as I had priorly
17	(sic) said to him, I was going to read to him a consent to
18	search his vehicle.
19	MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I'll ask this be
20	marked as People's Exhibit 3 for identification.
21	(People's Exhibit 3 marked for
22	identification.)
23	(Shown to witness.)
24	Q. Detective, if you could please take a look at wha
25	has been marked as People's Exhibit 3 for identification

·	Schulman - People - direct 50
1	purposes?
2	Do you recognize that?
3,	A. Yes, I do.
4	Q. What do you recognize that to be?
5	A. This is the pre-printed consent form that I used
6	to ask Mr. Gopaul for consent to search the vehicle that he
7	was the legal custodian of at the time.
8	Q. How do you know that that's the one you used in
9	this case with this defendant?
10	A. The handwriting of the items that I filled in are
11	in my handwriting, I witnessed when it was signed and I also
12	affixed my own signature on the bottom of the form.
13	Q. Is that a fair and accurate copy of the original
14	form?
15	A. Yes, it is.
16	MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, we would ask that
17	this be marked as People's 3 in evidence for purposes
18	of this hearing.
19	THE COURT: You're getting the original right
20	now, Mr. Schechter.
21	MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you, Judge.
22	(Shown to counsel.)
23	MR. SCHECHTER: No objection for purposes of
24	the hearing.
25	THE COURT: Without objection, People's 3 in

Schulman - People - direct evidence. (People's Exhibit 3 received in evidence.) 2 THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Johnson. 3 (Shown to witness.) 5 Q. Detective, if you could take a look at that document? 6 7 Could you tell us how it was that you read that document to Mr. Gopaul on June 24th, 2008? 8 While I was sitting with Mr. Gopaul I was filling 9 10 in the top captions that would need to be filled in for me 11 to read it to him. 12 After that was complete I then read, "I Harold 13 Gopaul am the owner/legal custodian of a 2006 Dodge Ram 14 bearing license plate number 22726JV and VIN number 1D7HA16NX6J220067, which is currently located at side of the 15 16 105 Precinct. 17 "I have been duly advised of my rights to: One, refuse such consent; two, require that a search warrant be 18 19 obtained prior to any search; three, that if I do consent to 20 a search, any evidence found as a result of such search can 21 and will be used against me in any criminal proceeding; 22 four, that I may withdraw my consent to search any time 23 prior to its conclusion. 24 "I knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily waive

my above rights and consent and authorize Detective Schulman

25

Schulman - People - direct

or his duly authorized agent of the New York City Police

Department to conduct said search."

- Q. And who signed this document?
- A. After Mr. Gopaul indicated that he would consent he again he read the form to himself and agreed that he would consent. He then affixed in his own handwriting, the date and time and he printed his name and he signed his name and then I signed my name below as witness.
- Q. Where it says date June 24th, 2008, time 5:30 a.m., is that your handwriting or the defendant's handwriting?
 - A. That is Mr. Gopaul's handwriting.
- Q. And next to the word subject where it is a printed name of Harold Gopaul and then a signature, who marked that printed name?
 - A. Mr. Gopaul.
 - Q. And did you observe him sign that document?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Prior to defendant signing this were any promises made to him?
 - A. No, there were not.
 - Q. Were there any threats made to him?
- 23 A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Any physical force used upon him?
- 25 A. No.

Schulman - People - direct 53 Was he still unhandcuffed? 1 Q. Yes, he was. 2 Α. 3 Had anybody -- any member of law enforcement entered or left the room up until that point? 5 Α. No. Did he indicate he wanted to speak to an attorney 6 7 at the time? 8 Α. No, he did not. 9 Q. Did he have any questions for you? 10 Α. No, did he not. 11 And he indicated orally prior to signing this that 0. he wished to waive his rights and consent to this? 12 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. Did you observe him read over the documents? 15 Α. Yes. 16 THE COURT: Detective, just to kind of put this -- put some context to this, are these forms being 17 presented to him after you've now read him his Miranda 18 19 warnings, as you've testified? 20 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 21 THE COURT: Is there any time that's on the forms or that you noted anywhere as to when these 22 23 events are taking place at all? 24 THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: On the forms themselves?

·	Schulman - People - direct 54
1	THE WITNESS: Yes.
2	Q. With regards to the I'm sorry, do you have bot
3	of the documents up there for you?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. With regards to the consent search that's been
6	marked into evidence of the home, that 5:20 a.m. time, is
7	that the time that the consent was read or the time the
8	defendant signed it?
9	A. The time that he's signing it.
10	Q. And on the consent form for the vehicle, the 5:30
11	a.m., what time does that represent, that 5:30 time?
12	A. That, again, represents the time that he is
13	signing it.
14	Q. And
15	A. Which he actually wrote in his own handwriting
16	just prior to signing it.
17	Q. And those were both signed after the Miranda
18	warnings were issued?
19	A. That is correct.
20	Q. And after the defendant signed the Miranda form?
21	A. That's correct.
22	Q. After both of those consent forms were signed what
23	did you do?
24	A. At that moment I stepped out and took a break for
25	a little while. I had to go back and speak to the victim

Schulman - People - direct 55 and get some other information. 1 2 Did there come a time when you came back into the 3 interview room to speak with the defendant? 4 Α. There did. 5 Approximately what time was that? Q. 6 THE WITNESS: Again, I'm going to refer to 7 that same report, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 Α. It was approximately 6:20 on the morning of 10 June 24th. What was the defendant doing at 6:20 when you went 11 12 into the interview room? 13 He was sitting awake, and appeared coherent, in 14 the same chair that he had been sitting in with his eyes 15 open. 16 Same interview room as before? Q. 17 Α. Same interview room. 18 Q. Was he handcuffed? 19 No, he was not. Α. 20 Q. Was your weapon still secured? 21 Α. Yes, it was. 22 Q. Was anybody else in the room? 23 Α. No, they were not. 24 Q. What did you do when you went into the interview 25 room?

Schulman - People - direct

Okay, I went in and asked Mr. Gopaul if he knew Α. why he was in custody and under arrest.

And he stated that, you know, on Saturday, prior, he had an argument and he had to slap Sana.

So I asked him if he wished to, you know, to make a written statement in regards to what had happened Saturday and he indicated yes.

- When you say Sana you're referring to Sana Awan, the complainant in this matter?
 - Α. That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Where was the victim while you were having this conversation with the defendant?
 - She was in another interview room in my office. Α.
- What did the defendant say to you after you asked Q. him if he would like to talk about what happened on that Saturday?
 - Α. Well, he then --

MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt the witness, your Honor, but the witness has been continually reading from his documents. I'm going to object because instead of it being his testimony, he's reading from documents and they're not in evidence.

THE COURT: There's times when I'm making my own notes and I may not see that myself.

Schulman - People - direct

Detective, if you're going to look at the documents just indicate you need to look at them and just tell Ms. Johnson and just identify -- I'm assuming, unless I hear from you differently, the document -- you're referring to the document that you have as approved, but our copies say unapproved?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Is that what you're referring to?

THE WITNESS: Sometimes I'm just looking

down, I'm not actually look looking at it.

THE COURT: Okay, if you're referring to any document just tell us you need to do that.

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

- Q. What did the defendant say to you after you asked him if he would like to talk to you about what happened on Saturday?
- A. He made that initial comment that he had an argument with her on Saturday and slapped her.

I asked him if he would like to make a written statement about that and he said yes. I then gave him a pad and a pen and he was allowed to write out a statement.

- Q. What did you say to him when you gave him the pad and the pen?
- A. Write down what happened, or something to that effect, very similar to that.

	Schulman - People - direct 58
1	Q. And you provided him with the pad and the pen?
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. And what did defendant do with the pad and pen?
4	A. He wrote out a statement.
5	MS. JOHNSON: I'm going to ask this be marked
6	as People's Exhibit 4 for identification.
7	THE COURT: People's 4.
8	(People's Exhibit 4 marked for
9	identification.)
10	THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Johnson?
11	MR. SCHECHTER: Can I see the original?
12	THE COURT: Are you going to be offering this
13	in evidence?
14	MS. JOHNSON: Yes, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: So why don't you give the
16	original to my officer?
17	(Shown to counsel.)
18	MR. SCHECHTER: May I have a moment, your
19	Honor?
20	THE COURT: Yes.
21	(Pause in the proceedings.)
22	MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, there's another
23	statement I'm going to be offering, so if we could just
24	have the detective pull that out now.
25	THE COURT: Well, I'm looking at MY clock.

Schulman - People - direct 59 Let's just deal with this one statement. 1 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. 2 (Pause in the proceedings.) 3 MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, I would just 4 like to say parenthetically, the copy of that statement 5 that was given to me does not contain a second page and 6 leaves out at least three or four lines on the bottom. 7 This is the first I've noticed the second page as well 8 as the bottom of that first page. 9 THE COURT: You're talking about the second 10 11 page? 12 MR. SCHECHTER: Of this statement. 13 THE COURT: It's a two-page statement, yes? 14 Yes. I only have one page. MR. SCHECHTER: 15 THE COURT: In terms of the Rosario material? 16 MR. SCHECHTER: In terms of my discovery 17 material, Judge. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me ask you this, 19 before we get to the parenthetical material, do you 20 have any objection to this coming into evidence? 21 MR. SCHECHTER: Not for purposes of the 22 hearing. 23 THE COURT: For purposes of the hearing. 24 MS. JOHNSON: We're talking about the 25 June 24th, 2008 statement first that was timed 6: --

	Proceedings 60
1	MR. SCHECHTER: 30.
2	MS. JOHNSON: 25 a.m.?
3	MR. SCHECHTER: Yes, that statement.
4	THE COURT: Detective, would you do me a
5	favor, just so the record is clear, look at what's been
6	marked People's 4 for identification and could you tell
7	us what time that statement is?
8	THE WITNESS: 6:25 a.m. on June 24th of 2008.
9	THE COURT: And how many pages is it?
10	MS. JOHNSON: It is two pages.
11	THE WITNESS: It is two pages, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: So at this point I'm going to
13	interrupt Ms. Johnson, we're going to break until
14	tomorrow.
15	MS. JOHNSON: For the uniformed officer.
16	THE COURT: For the uniformed officer.
17	MR. SCHECHTER: What is the officer's
18	commitments with respect to his return for purposes of
19	completion of the record?
20	THE COURT: I'm going to get that in a
21	minute.
22	Let me ask you this, detective, are you
23	unavailable tomorrow?
24	THE WITNESS: I am your Honor, actually, I
25	only got notified last minute last night about today

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings 61 and I didn't get home until 4 o'clock from working last time and then out of courtesy for the Court I made it a point of changing my schedule today, so I actually have my children in the morning tomorrow. THE COURT: Can you be here Monday morning? THE WITNESS: Again, I'll have my children. It will be a little difficult. THE COURT: I don't mean to be difficult myself and I understand. THE WITNESS: Is there a chance we can do Monday afternoon? I want to work with the Court. THE COURT: All right, what I'm going to do is plan on being here Monday, regardless. I'll let Ms. Johnson know as to whether or not I definitely need you here Monday morning or afternoon. MR. SCHECHTER: May I have a sidebar when the officer is off the stand? THE COURT: For now you are excused until Monday. Make sure you take your file with you. MR. SCHECHTER: Maybe you could hold him for one brief second while I have a sidebar with the Court, please?

THE COURT: Yeah, why don't you just gather

your stuff, detective, have a seat in the back of the

	Proceedings 62
1	courtroom.
2	(Witness steps down.)
3	(Discussion held at the bench, off the
4	record.)
5	THE COURT: Mr. Schechter, I'm going to ask
6	your client some questions relative to this applicatio
7	for daily copy.
8	Mr. Gopaul, I'm showing you a document that
9	believe your attorney went over with you earlier. It
10	appears to have your signature in there and it deals
11	with certain financial matters regarding your request
12	for minutes to be provided to your attorney on a daily
13	basis.
14	Is that your signature that appears there?
1 5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: And you went over this with your
17	attorney before signing it?
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: And everything that you all
20	the answers that are contained in there are true?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
22	MR. SCHECHTER: Just so that the record is
23	clear and your Honor understands, your Honor, this
24	document it's his wife he has a business, an
25	extermination business, that's in his wife's name. He

Proceedings

is the worker for his company and paid a salary, but the wife is the owner of the company and the money that is alleged there in that document is money that is in the wife's name and the wife's bank accounts.

THE COURT: Okay, all right, so I've signed it. I'll direct my reporter to provide you with daily copy.

MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Gopaul, listen to my clerk for a moment.

THE CLERK: Mr. Gopaul, you have to appear tomorrow morning.

If you fail to appear a warrant can be issued for your arrest, you will be subject to the charge of bail jumping and the case will proceed in your absence.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Detective, we need you to be here 9:30 Monday.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: And, you know, I was told that this matter was ready to go. It's got to go from day to day. Everybody has certain scheduling orders that they have to follow, including myself, so we're going to need you here 9:30 on Monday, okay?

	Proceedings	64
1	(Proceedings adjourned to Friday	y, March 1st,
2	2009 at 9:30 a.m.)	
3		
4		
5		
. 6		
7		
8		
9		•
10		
11		
12		
13		,
14		,
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		:
25		

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK 1 COUNTY OF NASSAU : CRIMINAL TERM PART 80 2 3 Indictment THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, No. 2415N/08 4 -against-5 HAROLD GOPAUL, Sex Abuse 1 6 Huntley/Mapp Defendant. Hearings 7 May 1, 2009 8 252 Old Country Road 9 Mineola, New York 10 BEFORE: 11 HONORABLE JAMES P. McCORMACK, 12 Acting Supreme Court Justice 13 14 APPEARANCES: (As previously noted.) 15 16 17 THE CLERK: The People against Harold Gopaul, 18 Indictment 2415N of 2008 19 20 MS. JOHNSON: For the People, Jamie Johnson. MR. SCHECHTER: On behalf of the defendant, 21 Harold Gopaul, Donald R. Schechter, 80-02 Kew Gardens 22 23 Road, Kew Gardens, New York. 24 I'm ready to proceed. 25 THE COURT: People?

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, yesterday we had sent a subpoena yesterday early morning for -- and, in fact, it was sent also while I wasn't at work on Wednesday for Police Officer Alfaro, A-l-f-a-r-o, to appear for the hearing. We had sent one subpoena for her to appear at the hearing yesterday and we sent another one for her to appear today.

I have spoken personally with police liaison from the NYPD and I've spoken to police liaison from Nassau County.

Subpoenas were sent for Officer Alfaro for yesterday. They were also sent for today. I confirmed this morning at 9:30 in the morning with a sergeant at the 105 Precinct that they did, in fact, receive an appropriate and an accurate subpoena for Police Officer Alfaro.

However, the sergeant indicated to me that it was what they call RDO, Officer Alfaro's regular day off. They called her on her personal cell phone and did attempt to notify her to be here not only yesterday, but today.

She had not responded to their calls or their messages when they advised her that she would be need ed in court.

When I spoke to the sergeant this morning he

we

said that despite even contacting her, there may have been an issue with overtime through the city.

Be that as it may, I asked about having her possibly for this afternoon and then definitely for Monday.

He advised me her next regular scheduled tour is Tuesday. I told him I would be sending a subpoena either way for Monday for hearing and for Tuesday as well.

His response to me was that even if I send it and they receive it, just as they had with the other subpoena, most likely they would not be sending the officer until Tuesday, her regularly scheduled tour back.

They advised me they would notify her about Monday once we sent the subpoena and once they received it, but due to the fact that it is her scheduled day off if she does not personally respond to it and for overtime constraints they cannot promise me they would send her before Tuesday morning.

THE COURT: What does the New York City jurisdictions do with their cases when one of their officers is off?

Do they just refuse to acknowledge the subpoenas and not come to court or is it just because

67

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

68

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

it's coming out of Nassau County?

MS. JOHNSON: I actually asked the sergeant what their procedures were for notification.

He said they require 24 hours notice, which we did give, but 24 hours notice from their last scheduled tour. So because she has not been at the precinct and she has been consistently on days off, they haven't seen her to actually give her the notice.

THE COURT: So when did she last work?

MS. JOHNSON: She wasn't working yesterday to receive the notice.

THE COURT: You said you sent a subpoena on Wednesday for yesterday.

MS. JOHNSON: It was sent Wednesday, your Honor. I was not at work on Wednesday, but police liaison in my office through my paralegal received it and the NYPD did receive it on Wednesday for Thursday.

So they have not been able to get in personal contact with her to advise her, since she hasn't been --

THE COURT: I have a hard time thinking that if the New York City Police Department needs to reach one of their members that they're unable to reach them.

MS. JOHNSON: And the sergeant advised me they contacted her on her cell phone. She has not

answered it and she has not responded.

And they further indicated that other than that, due to overtime constraints, they would not be able to guarantee that they would, in fact, be able to send her.

But they did say either way they have not been able to reach her.

THE COURT: So what do you suggest?

MS. JOHNSON: My suggestion to your Honor
is --

THE COURT: Does the New York City Police

Department honor court orders any more or they don't
honor subpoenas?

Did you ask them if that would be something that they would recognize?

MS. JOHNSON: I spoke to the sergeant who was in charge of their scheduling and I asked him, I said, can you continue to follow up with her?

He said yes, he would give her a call, but at this point whatever your Honor suggests -- I would absolutely make another phone call, advise them that the Court has requested her presence, not just the DA's Office, that this is a continued hearing in a criminal case.

They've been aware of this, but at this point

2.

WS

I'm at the whim of, unfortunately, the 105th Precinct and the New York City Police Department.

THE COURT: Mr. Schechter?

MR. SCHECHTER: If it please the Court, the

105 Precinct had been informed earlier by Judge Donnino
in a nice way to cooperate with my investigator so my
investigator could get pictures of the room, the
interrogation room, where my client was interrogated.

They, for lack of a better term, jerked my investigator around for the better part of a week claiming that the room could not be used because the room was in constant use. All we needed was three minutes just to snap photographs. They refused to cooperate.

Judge Donnino then made another call asking when this could happen and they did it in a nice way and just short of an order and finally last, I believe -- a few days ago my investigator was finally able to get access to that room called the box and got pictures.

They have been stonewalling and I think one of the reasons for stonewalling is a question of jurisdiction. The point of view of the city, and I've dealt with this for years already, New York City Police Department says taxpayers of New York City pay their

salary, that this is out of county, therefore they do not want to utilize the services of the New York City Police Department for out-of-county work and that is why they would not be cooperating.

If this were a New York City case I am pretty certain that the police officer, over time or not, would be here.

My question to your Honor is, what if we were on trial and we had a jury in the box and continuity --

THE COURT: That's my question.

I understand, Ms. Johnson, you're here on behalf of the District Attorney of this county, normally you're used to dealing with the Police Department for Nassau County, but that's, quite frankly, what my question is to you.

Would they -- have they indicated to you that if the officers are not working that they will not come to court even on matters that involve their own jurisdiction?

MS. JOHNSON: They have not indicated anything about that, your Honor.

What I would intend to do, then, is -obviously we know that these witnesses are going to be
necessary for trial. I will advise the commanding
officer of what the situation is and if I have to have

something in writing from them that they're going to send them to give to the Court, then that's what I'll do, but nobody has indicated to me that because it's a Nassau County case that that's not why they're sending them.

And, in fact, I've been in constant communication with the Queen's DA and I know overtime -- just as overtime is a problem out here, it's no different in the city.

THE COURT: I understand all of the jurisdictions are under, you know, budgetary constraints and I'm sure New York City is not immune to it either.

I'm just rather shocked that they would get subpoenas two days in a row -- do they even give you, if you will, a heads up to say don't expect this officer to be here?

MS. JOHNSON: In fact, yesterday when we were at a bench conference at the hearing I advised the Court that yesterday, while I was here doing the hearing, my paralegal called the city to confirm that they received it and they did and there were no problems. I guess we had -- them receiving it and them actually having the officer here are two different things for the city.

But we had no indication, no phone calls, that there was any problem and, in fact, this morning the sergeant confirmed with me that the teletype was sent appropriately, it was received within the appropriate amount of time, but just that they couldn't reach out to her.

THE COURT: All right, who is -- the sergeant that you're referring to is the sergeant at the 105?

MS. JOHNSON: He is a sergeant at the 105 that when I spoke to -- when I called the precinct I asked who would be in charge of speaking to somebody in regard to a subpoena for an officer that's supposed to come no Nassau County. I didn't catch his last name, but he was in charge of, I guess, the scheduling for them.

THE COURT: Okay, do you have a number and a name that if my chambers staff should call I would be able to do so?

MS. JOHNSON: I have it on an e-mail in my office, so I do have the number you would be able to contact.

THE COURT: All right, I'll try to see what I can do.

MR. SCHECHTER: I understand, your Honor.

I'm going to respectfully ask, your Honor,

ws

that henceforth, since it appears the New York City

Police Department is not being cooperative here, that

the Court so order every subpoena with respect to the

New York City Police Department and make it a Court

order because unless your Honor threatens these people

with contempt, they're going to hold this court in

contempt, which is what they're doing now.

Now, I would normally be criticizing my

Now, I would normally be criticizing my adversary for not having seen this and done this for a week in advance.

However, counsel has been on trial up until
Tuesday last and needed Wednesday to basically
re-charge her batteries and still sent messages to her
paralegal to take care of this while she wasn't here.
So it wasn't as if there was a hiatus from her point of
view in terms of bad faith. So I'm not claiming bad
faith on the part of counsel.

However, because the New York City Police

Department appears to be contumacious in this

situation, I have a man here accused of a very serious

crime, and because they seem to be flouting the

subpoenas of the prosecutors of Nassau County, I don't

see any other basis or any other means of compelling

them to be here unless you threaten them with jail.

There's no other way to do it.

ws

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

75

THE COURT: Before we go from A to Z, Mr. Schechter and start throwing adjectives around like contumacious and flouting Court orders, which they haven't up until now other than the DA's subpoena, I would like to speak to the people in New York City to find out whether or not there is any sort of budgetary issue that will keep on arising during the course of this case and I'll deal with it as I think appropriate.

MR. SCHECHTER: I appreciate the Court's intercession in this matter.

My only concern is I remember when I was a prosecutor we didn't have it as bad as it is today, but certainly in situations such as this I would ask the Court to so order the subpoena and tell the precinct or the location if this officer doesn't come here, and the courts will do that, then they suffer the penalty of me considering a sanction of contempt because the New York City Police Department, as most police departments, it's even worse in the federal government, of course, but the New York City Police Department believes many times that they are above the law and that they don't have to obey the orders of the Court and I'm asking the Court to do that.

THE COURT: Mr. Schechter, your past experience is of no moment to me and I'm not going to

Proceedings

sit here and get into a bashing session of the New York
City Police Department because of your prior
experiences, whether they're justified or not, and let
me deal with it the way I think it's appropriate to
deal with. I appreciate your suggestions, but at this
point they're just suggestions.

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, one thing that the sergeant did say to me, I don't quite know what it means because I don't know what their lingo is, but I did ask him if the officer was notified and you spoke with her and then she failed to come to Nassau what would happen. He said she would be given a CD. I don't know what a CD means in NYPD terms, but obviously there would have been ramifications to the officer had she actually spoken to the precinct.

THE COURT: Let's just move on for a moment.

I take it that with respect to Schulman, I would ask you to be in contact with him today or this afternoon. I don't know whether he's working this morning. It sounded like he wasn't available this morning.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ JOHNSON: No, he's not working. I have his cell phone number and I --

THE COURT: I would ask you to be in contact with him, be here on Monday.

WS

My understanding is that Judge Donnino had indicated to you, the DA, that after the hearing he was going to give or had agreed to, if you will, a one or two-day period where the case was not going to be -- in other words, it wasn't going to go straight into trial. It was going to be a one or two-day period, I guess, for you to prepare, whatever.

I think in light of what's going on you may have used your one or two-day period between today and Monday.

So I would tell both of you to prepare that at the conclusion of the hearing, whether it's Tuesday or Wednesday morning, that we're going to be picking a jury by the afternoon.

MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you, your Honor.

One other suggestion, if I might.

I think that the videotaped confession is something -- since the Court has no familiarity with this case whatsoever, the videotaped confession is about a half hour.

Counsel, I don't believe, has done anything with respect to the Miranda warnings on the video confession.

However, if we could somehow have a mechanism where that the predicate -- the predicates to the

introduction of that are done, perhaps we could allow the Court to see the videotape so we can get on with this.

Because, your Honor, the videotape has within it some of the things that I'm going to be talking about on cross-examination. I don't know if counsel has the ability today of getting any people here with respect to the video confession.

Maybe the District Attorney in Queens County can come out here and -- he was present on the video and I think he is -- was present, at least, if not administered the rights to my client on the video.

So if he can come here perhaps we could at least get that done?

MS. JOHNSON: He's on trial. I already tried that. ADA Rosenblatt actually was picking a jury yesterday and I was going to have him here as a backup. So he's actually on trial.

THE COURT: I thought you were only calling two witnesses.

MS. JOHNSON: I am.

Because what counsel was saying was instead of continuing with Detective Schulman for purposes of the video, I could have called the Queens ADA who actually is on the video, but I can't, he's on trial.

	Proceedings 79
1	I tried that already.
2	THE COURT: So you plan on calling the Queens
3	DA at all for the purpose of the hearing?
4	MS. JOHNSON: No, not at all.
5	MR. SCHECHTER: There was two, not only Jared
6	Rosenblatt, but there was another DA that
7	MS. JOHNSON: I was going to do it if
8	Detective Schulman was completely unavailable, but he's
9	coming back.
10	THE COURT: Is Officer Schulman present in
11	the videotape?
12	MS. JOHNSON: Yes, it's two ADAs the video
13	person and the detective. So the detective is there
14	throughout the whole video.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Schechter, what I ask you to
16	do before you leave here today, give my clerk both your
17	office phone and cell phone in the event that we're
18	going to have Schulman here on Monday.
19	MS. JOHNSON: Correct.
20	THE COURT: Assume you're going to be here on
21	Monday.
22	MR. SCHECHTER: If that's the case, I suppose
23	we ready and pass until Monday rather than doing this
24	torturous kind of
25	THE COURT: There's nothing we can do.

The last bit of advice I'm going to give both of you is whatever pretrial issues you want me to decide prior to jury selection, you better get it to me in writing with whatever case law you feel is appropriate to back it up. I'm not going to have a whole day's worth of banter back and forth about oral applications because it sounded like that's what was going to start happening yesterday, even though we're only doing the hearing. You better get it to me in writing, you better have it backed up with case law,

MS. JOHNSON: I'll start working on that.

MR. SCHECHTER: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: We'll see you -- you'll back here Monday morning at 9:30.

you better get it to my secretary a day or two ahead of

MR. SCHECHTER: Yes, Judge.

(Proceedings adjourned to Monday, May 4th, 2009 at 9:30 a.m.)

time.

1 SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK. COUNTY OF NASSAU : CRIMINAL TERM PART 80 2 3 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, : Indictment 4 : No. 2415N/08 -against-5 HAROLD GOPAUL, : Sex Abuse 1 6 Defendant. : Huntley/Mapp -----X Hearings 7 8 May 4, 2009 9 252 Old Country Road Mineola, New York 10 BEFORE: 11 12 HONORABLE JAMES P. McCORMACK, Acting Supreme Court Justice 13 14 APPEARANCES: 15 (As Previously Noted) 16 17 18 THE CLERK: Continued hearing, People of the 19 State of New York against Harold Gopaul, 20 Indictment 2415N of 2008. 21 MS. JOHNSON: Good morning, Judge. 22 For the People, Jamie Johnson. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Schechter, do you want to put 24 your appearance on the record? 25 MR. SCHECHTER: On behalf of Harold Gopaul,

Donald R. Schechter, 80-02 Kew Gardens Road, Kew Gardens, New York.

Your Honor, I would like the record to reflect I have made a motion in limine, a courtesy copy which I gave to the Court. Since time is pressing I had served the District Attorney myself in person with her copy.

It relates to what we were discussing regarding the use of any pending charged materials, namely the information or charges that my client is charged with in Queens County.

The Court of Appeals, in fact, proscribes that conduct.

I submitted my motion to the Court and, as I said, my copies to the DA and that would include a redaction of the confession which the People have indicated they intend to use on direct examination.

So those are the -- that is my motion in limine.

The Court had asked me for case support, case material, and I have supplied the Court's request.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I did receive a copy of this.

I will have a written response in response to

ws

his motion in limine along with any Molineaux by the People. I'll have it filed with the clerk's office today and I'll just fax over a courtesy copy to the Court because I know it takes some time to get there.

I did also provide, I gave it to your clerk, a copy of the grand jury minutes. Your Honor had requested a copy of those.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. JOHNSON: And this morning I turned over additional Rosario material. I provided a copy to the Court as well as counsel.

I haven't had a chance to put a cover on it so let me, for the record -- the packet includes a property clerk's invoice for a two-speed massager white/gray, a property voucher for a white body massager, Officer Alfaro's memo book, the actual date of June 24th, 2008, along with the outside cover of the memo book, the unapproved complaint report related to the recovery of the property, prisoner movement slip, the arrest paperwork from the NYPD, two pages, the on-line booking system arrest work sheet, that's several pages, some of them are double-sided, so I just direct the Court's attention to that, the complaint follow-up information system index sheet, the detective's bureau investigation review work sheet,

and, your Honor, there was testimony regarding unapproved versus approved reports.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. JOHNSON: The last three pages of this are identical to the unapproved. The only difference is that this is the approved version and I'll note what the difference is.

On the last page it indicates the supervisor's name, Sergeant Hanrahan, and the word unapproved is missing. Other than that, the contents of it is identical to what was provided last week.

THE COURT: And you've received that,
Mr. Schechter?

MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, I haven't had an opportunity to peruse what she's given me nor to read it. I mean, I just got it in court today.

One other thing, your Honor. I submitted two subpoenas for the Court to sign. My investigator is waiting for those. I request that those be signed forthwith so I can get her out to serve them.

THE COURT: Right. Actually, I was going to go over that next.

MR. SCHECHTER: I believe, your Honor, those are ex parte applications. I don't think that -- since the District Attorney is able to serve her subpoenas

WS

without notifying me --

8 .

THE COURT: I understand, but I do think that there may be matters that -- in these documents that may very well have some privilege or confidentiality that may attach to it.

So I'm going to sign the subpoenas, the only question -- the only direction I'm going to ask, and I'll have my law secretary just make a notation on the subpoena, that they get brought to my chambers so I can review them in camera.

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, can I -- I don't know if the Court is willing to disclose, but I would just like to know what they're for.

MR. SCHECHTER: That's the purpose of their being ex parte.

THE COURT: At this time I'm going to sign the subpoenas.

MS. JOHNSON: Just so your Honor knows, counsel had provided Judge Donnino, when we were before him, with various subpoenas, including My Space or Facebook and New York City Board of Education. I don't know if those are returned to Judge Donnino as part of the file, so --

THE COURT: I'm hearing that for the first time. I'm not in possession of anything from Judge

86

Donnino other than the court file.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCHECHTER: I respectfully request an opportunity to review what counsel says she has given me so I can respond adequately to the Court's inquiry, your Honor. She's indicated she's given me some new Rosario material and I haven't had, really, a chance to look at it. I'm trying to arrange my file on the desk and -- however, the other materials that I had requested, your Honor, from counsel and from -- I asked the Court direct they provide me have not been provided me based upon what she said and on that basis ${\tt I}$ -- you know, I have an issue with the Rosario material that was requested and one of them is a mandatory report that the police officer is required to submit with respect to allegations of child abuse and those documents I have not been given and unless he did not do so, which means he violated the law, I request a copy of those reports.

That's just one of them, Judge. There was several others that I requested as well.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, as to first that, Judge, I don't have a problem turning them over at trial, but I don't see how they're Rosario for purposes of a Huntley Hearing or for purposes of a Mapp Hearing.

One other request was there was an issue

Proceedings 87 1 about the second page of the written statements. 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 MS. JOHNSON: I have a copy of that and unfortunately the paper that the Police Department uses 4 5 is bigger than 11 by 14, so the part that was missing on the first page when it was Xeroxed just says to be 6 7 continued on the other page so I'll have copies of that 8 for counsel right now. 9 THE COURT: All right, could you also, at some point, give copies for the Court because --10 MS. JOHNSON: I will, Judge. 11 12 THE COURT: These are the defendants 13 so-called written statements, yes? 14 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: And I take it there's one page 16 from June 24th, '08 at 7:30 a.m. and that's just a 17 single page? 18 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. 19 THE COURT: And then there's a second one or 20 actually the first one from June 24th of '08 at 21 6:25 a.m.? 22 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. 23 THE COURT: And that's the two-page one? 24 MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

25

THE COURT: Which I also don't have, other

		Proceedings 88
1		than the first page.
		MS. JOHNSON: And then there is 8:30 on June
2		we will be a second of the sec
3		24th. That is a question/answer page.
4	t t	THE COURT: Yes, that I have.
5		MS. JOHNSON: I'm giving counsel and the
б		Court the copy of the second page.
7		Judge, when I made a copy of the first page
8		to show the bottom of it, it cuts off the top of it so
9		I'm going to use one to mark it. I'll show it to
10		counsel and if he wants me to copy it as two pages, the
11		problem is the Xerox paper just isn't big enough.
12		THE COURT: All right, could I just take a
13		look at what you have in your hand?
14		MS. JOHNSON: Sure.
15		(Shown to Court.)
16		MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I'll show
17		Mr. Schechter the bottom of the page. It just seems to
18		get cut off every time we copy it.
19		THE COURT: All right, Mr. Schechter, I don't
20		see any reason why we can't proceed with Detective
21		Shulman at this point. We're still in, I take it, the
22		middle of his direct or coming at the end of his
23		direct.
24		The additional Rosario material here, in
25		large part, seems to pertain to Officer Alfaro.

б

Proceedings

MR. SCHECHTER: Well, I would like the opportunity, prior to beginning my cross-examination of Detective Shulman to review this material, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I intend to give that to you.

MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you.

And the other issue is the Rosario material that I had named earlier on the record that I have not been supplied with. I don't think we've really dealt with that, Judge.

Now, counsel has indicated to me she was going to contact the Queens District Attorney's Office with respect to materials contained by him in his file and I submit that's inadequate.

As the prosecutor in this case it is her obligation to provide me with those Rosario materials that I am entitled to under the law, whether or not Jared Rosenblatt has them or not.

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I spoke to the ADA in Queens. He faxed me over on Thursday and Friday a copy of his file that he had not yet provided to us.

There is handwritten notes in the file. I showed them this morning to Police Officer Alfaro and to Detective Shulman. They are neither of their notes. They are actually the DA's work product and his information and Rosario material and at this point,

Proceedings

from what I can read from it, most of it has to do with conversations with the complainant and his work product with regards to the file.

THE COURT: When you say his, you're referring to --

MS. JOHNSON: The DA in Queens. Yes, Judge.

MR. SCHECHTER: I would ask the Court to examine the documents, your Honor, to make the determination if there's Rosario issues there.

Additionally, it's my experience that

District Attorneys routinely, when they speak to

arresting officer or complainants, make notes on their

file concerning the conversations and therefore if the

materials are copied from Mr. Rosenblatt's file

regarding conversations he had with the officer who is

testifying now, I certainly am entitled to those.

So if counsel is making some representation as to work product, I would like the Court to make sua sponte.

THE COURT: Well, is this -- I thought I understood you to say that these are notes that the DA had with the complainant, no?

MS. JOHNSON: The first page, Judge, is notes about the complainant and notes -- the ones that refer to the detective, it appears to be work product with

regard to his review of the file.

I'm happy to show them to the Court. Two pages are completely about -- it says interview with the complainant. I'll provide them to the Court now, and the rest of it, other than grand jury testimony that he has already provided to me, is the domestic incident report, which wouldn't -- has nothing to do with the Huntley or the Mapp portion, I would submit to the Court, and the actual DA's -- their version -- we have yellow cards in our files for notes, their version of the yellow card and their ECAB paperwork that references bail information, nothing about the detective, but I'll happily hand that up to the Court.

THE COURT: One other item I think

Mr. Schechter had referenced last week is is there any
reports that got generated by anybody with regard to
the detective requesting any kind of commendation or
recognition with regard to the case itself?

MR. SCHECHTER: No. It would be the commanding officer, after speaking to the detective, would then make a recommendation.

THE COURT: Right, I understand.

MS. JOHNSON: I didn't see anything in his file. I can step out, ask him and double check.

THE COURT: Why don't you do that?

92

1 Why don't you hand me up that material so I can at least take a look at that? 2 3 (Shown to Court.) (Pause in the proceedings.) 4 THE COURT: And the answer is? 5 He doesn't know. 6 7 MS. JOHNSON: There was no request for 8 departmental recognition made in this case by the 9 officer or the detective. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 (Pause in the proceedings.) 12 MR. SCHECHTER: We also have that request for 13 the report he was supposed to mandatorily (sic) make to 14 the --15 THE COURT: Let's see. 16 I take it, Ms. Johnson, that you don't have 17 the report that Mr. Schechter is referring to or you're 18 not aware of its existence. MS. JOHNSON: I do. I believe I said there's 19 20 nothing in it that's relevant for purposes of the 21 hearing. 22 MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, I, for the life of me, don't understand why prosecutors do this. 23 24 Rosario material, it's sort of like trial by ambush, 25 they give it to you at the last minute --

2.1

Proceedings

THE COURT: Mr. Schechter, before we get on soap boxes and give speeches can I look at the material before --

(Paused in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Ms. Johnson, this -- the documents that you handed to me, this is from the Queen's Assistant DA?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

THE COURT: The first page, is this his notes of his interview with the complainant?

MS. JOHNSON: I don't have another copy of it, Judge, so I would have to take a look at what the Court is looking at.

Your Honor, I'm just going to step out and ask the detective to show me which is the ACS work sheet because they all look alike to me.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: All right, just to try to address some of these Rosario materials, Mr. Schechter, the packet or material Ms. Johnson gave me from the Queen's Assistant DA would appear to me, for the most part to, be his interview with the complainant in this case.

There doesn't appear to be any material, at least at this time, at this stage of the hearing, that

Proceedings

would be considered Rosario material. That may be different as far as the trial is concerned as far as the complainant is concerned. I don't see anything really here that would touch upon the issues that are going to be addressed at this hearing.

People, do you want to -- what's the other material?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, as to the adult and child protective child services information, there was part of, in one of the complaint reports, our version of a crime report, there was reference to it.

I just stepped outside and spoke to Detective Shulman. He never spoke to adult protective services. In fact, he said by the time he met with the victim adult protective service was already at the precinct meeting with the victim, so another officer, not testifying at this hearing, would have prepared that paperwork and contacted ACS.

He did indicate he did speak with them, but no paperwork was generated from him and they were already there when he got there, so --

THE COURT: All right, and I think, having myself reviewed the portion of our testimony that we've had so far, he does state when the complainant does come to the precinct I think an ACS worker is there, as

. 1	Proceedings 95
1	a matter of fact?
2	MR. SCHECHTER: I'm sorry, your Honor?
3	THE COURT: I think in his direct testimony
4	so far Detective Shulman has testified that there was
5	an ACS worker that was present at the 105 Precinct
6	interviewing the complainant.
7	Anything else, Mr. Schechter?
8	MR. SCHECHTER: Not at this time, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: All right, so, if we could
10	MS. JOHNSON: Let me just rev up, make sure
11	this is working.
12	THE COURT: I think, Ms. Johnson, we were at
13	People's 4?
14	MS. JOHNSON: Yes, I have that, your Honor.
15	And I believe only one page was marked, so
16	I'll put it on the record.
17	(The witness, Detective Leonard Shulman,
18	having previously been sworn, resumed the witness
19	stand.)
20	THE CLERK: Detective, you're reminded that
21	you're still under oath.
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	MS. JOHNSON: May I, Judge?
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, when we left off on

Shulman - People - direct 96 1 Thursday I had asked for the June 24th, 6:25 statement 2 to be marked. It is two pages. One page was marked. I just want the record to note that it is a two-page 3 4 document. I don't know if the Court reporter has to 5 change it on the sticker to say it's actually two 6 pages. 7 MR. SCHECHTER: May I see the document, please? 8 9 (Shown to counsel.) 10 MS. JOHNSON: If I could have it shown to the 11 witness, please? 12 (Shown to witness.) 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION CONT'D 14 BY MS. JOHNSON: 15 Detective Shulman, if you could take a look at 16 People's 4, the two-page document for identification 17 purposes, please? 18 Do you recognize that? 19 Α. Yes, I do. 20 .What do you recognize it to be? 21 It is a photocopy of a two-page statement that was Α. 22 written by Mr. Gopaul in my presence. 23 Is that a fair and accurate copy of the original Ο. statement that you took on June 24th, 2008? 24 25 Α. Yes, it is.

	Shulman - People - direct 97
1	MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I would ask that
2	that be marked into evidence for purposes of the
3	hearing.
4	MR. SCHECHTER: May I have a voir dire, your
5	Honor?
6	THE COURT: Yes.
7	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. SCHECHTER:
9	Q. Detective Shulman, that isn't a fair and accurate
10	copy of the original, is it?
11	A. Pardon me?
12	Q. That is not a fair and accurate copy of the
13	original, is it?
14	A. It's a photocopy, but it represents what the
15	original looks like.
16	Q. Did you tell the grand jury that the there's a
17	little scribble that happened to get written on the paper?
18	MR. SCHECHTER: I don't have a page number,
19	Judge, so I cannot refer to the page number.
20	Q. Did you tell them there's a little scribble that
21	just happened to get written on the original that's not on
22	the copy?
23	MS. JOHNSON: Which page?
24	MR. SCHECHTER: Counsel, you did not give me
25	a cover page, so I can't tell you what date it is. I

	Shurman - People - direct 98
1	can't tell you what page number it is because there's
2	no page numbers on here.
3	Let me just say, in the copies on the top yo
4	may want to look on the right top you might want to
5	look up 66. If you look in the right corner on the
6	top, 66.
7	A. I'm not sure what document you're referring me to
8	look at.
9	MR. SCHECHTER: May I approach the witness,
10	your Honor?
11	THE COURT: Yes.
12	Q. Detective Shulman, did you tell the grand jury
13	that the original had some scribble that happened to get
14	written on the paper of the original that's not on the copy
15	Did you tell them that?
16	A. I might have, but I don't believe I wasn't
17	referring to the statement. There's more than one statement
18	in this case.
19	Q. Which statement were you referring to there?
20	A. Well, I believe I was speaking in regards to a
21	statement that we haven't yet come to.
22	Q. May I see the statement you've got there?
23	THE COURT: You're talking about the one
24	that's been marked?
25	MR. SCHECHTER: The one before the Court,

i	Shulman - People - direct 99
1	yeah.
2	(Shown to counsel.)
3	MR. SCHECHTER: I stand corrected. Thank
4	you, Judge. I have no more questions at this time of
5	the witness on voir dire.
6	THE COURT: Any objection for the purposes of
7	the hearing for this statement being received?
8	MR. SCHECHTER: None for the purpose of the
9	hearing, Judge.
10	THE COURT: So marked.
11	MS. JOHNSON: If I could have that marked,
12	please, your Honor?
13	(People's Exhibit 4 received in evidence.)
14	MS. JOHNSON: If I could have it shown to the
15	witness?
16	(Shown to witness.)
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION CONT'D
18	BY MS. JOHNSON:
19	Q. Detective Shulman, if you could take a look at
20	People's 4 in evidence, that two-page statement?
21	Who provided the name, address, date and time that
22	appears on that document?
23	A. Mr. Gopaul.
24	Q. Is there any part of any page of that document
25	that is in your handwriting?

Shulman - People - direct

A. On Page 2 I affixed my signature indicating my shield number and then I noted a date and time at the

conclusion of this written statement.

Q. Can you explain to us how it was that it came about that the defendant, after being given a piece of paper and a pen, wrote this statement?

What happened in the room?

A. I had explained to Mr. Gopaul that, you know, his daughter had made some allegations and I got to the point I asked him if he wanted to make a statement, if he wanted to make a written statement.

He indicated he did.

I gave him a pad and a pen. I said, you know, "If you can indicate your name, address, phone number and today's date and time on the top and then if you could write what your story is."

Q. What information did you give the defendant about what his daughter had said?

THE WITNESS: I'm just going to refer back to my complaint follow-up, your Honor, just to refresh my memory?

A. Okay, I had asked him if he knew why he was under arrest and in custody a few moments prior to this statement and he said on the Saturday before he had an argument with his daughter an he slapped her.

Shulman - People - direct

So I then asked him if he would like to make a written statement about it and upon indicating yes is when I gave him an opportunity to make a written statement about what had occurred.

- Q. Did you explain to the defendant what type of information should be put into this two-page document?
- A. Other than his words about what had transpired with his daughter.
- Q. Did you watch him sign this and did you watch him write it?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Did you ask him if he wanted to make any changes?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. What did he say?
- 15 A. He said no.
 - Q. At any time while he was writing the statement did he ask to speak to an attorney?
 - A. No, he did not.
 - Q. If you could take a look at the first page, the first line of the first paragraph, where it indicates Saturday, June 21st, 2008?

Do you see the date where it says June 21st?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And do you see that there is a one marked over the two on the 22nd?

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Shulman - People - direct 102
1	A. Yes, I do.
2	Q. Who made that marking?
3	A. Mr. Gopaul.
4	Q. Detective, can you read for us what has been
5	marked into evidence as People's 4?
6	THE COURT: Is that really necessary?
7	MS. JOHNSON: If your Honor
8	THE COURT: No.
9	MS. JOHNSON: Even better. Thank you, Judge.
10	Q. At any time during the time the defendant was
11	writing the statement did he ask to speak to an attorney?
12	A. No, he did not.
13	Q. At any time did he tell you he no longer wished to
14	speak to you?
15	A. No, he did not.
16	Q. At any time did he indicate he had any questions
17	for you?
18	A. No, he did not.
19	Q. Was he cooperative with you?
20	A. Yes, he was.
21	Q. Was he handcuffed at the time?
22	A. No, he was not.
23	Q. Was your weapon still secured?
24	A. Yes, it was.
25	Q. And other than telling the defendant other than

103 Shulman - People - direct asking him if he wanted to make any statement was there any 1 conversation between the defendant and yourself while he was 2 actually writing? 3 Α. No. 4 And you observed him sign it? 5 Ο. 6 Α. Yes, I did. Okay. Was that the end of your contact with 7 0. 8 Harold Gopaul? No, it was not. 9 Α. What happened -- excuse me, let me step back for 10 Q. one second. 11 Did you ask the defendant to read his statement 12 after he wrote it out? 13 I did. 14 Α. 15 And was that the time you asked him if he wanted Q. 16 to make any changes? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Did you observe him read the statement over? Q. 19 Α. Yes. 20 Q. Okay. What did defendant ask of you following 21 signing the statement? 22 He asked if he could use the restroom. I ceased Α. 23 the interview and I brought him to the restroom. 24 Q. The restroom is outside of the interview room? 25 Yes, it is. Α.

Shulman - People - direct 104

- Q. Was he handcuffed when he was brought to the restroom?
 - A. Yes, he was.

- Q. And where did you bring him after the restroom?
- A. He was brought to the restroom. He was unhandcuffed so he could do what he needed to do in the restroom. He was then rehandcuffed and brought back to my office to the interview room where the handcuffs were taken off him.
- Q. And what happened in the interview room when you came back from the restroom?
- A. Initially, I just had Mr. Gopaul sit in the interview room and I took a little break from speaking to him.
 - Q. Where did you go?
- A. I believe I went to speak to the victim. I probably went to my desk.

MR. SCHECHTER: Objection to what the officer probably did, Judge.

THE COURT: Yeah, if you recall what you did, detective -- if you're not sure just tell us.

THE WITNESS: I'm not 100 percent sure. I know I did other things.

- Q. You left the interview room?
- A. Yes, I did.

Shulman - People - direct 105 Who was with the defendant when you left the 1 Q. interview room? 2 3 Α. He was by himself. Was there an officer outside the room? Q. 4 I don't recall, but the interview room was 5 Α. б secured. 7 Q. When you left was he handcuffed? No, he was not. Α. 8 Did he ask you for anything before you left? 9 Q. No, he did not. 10 Α. 11 Did you have any conversation with him before you Q. 12 left? I believe I said, "I'll be back with you in a 13 little while, " or something similar to that nature. 14 15 Q. Did there come a time when you went back to the interview room? 16 17 Α. There did. 18 Approximately what time was that? Q. 19 I think it was about 7:20 or 7:25. 20 Q. What was your purpose in going back to the 21 interview room? 22 Α. To continue speaking to Mr. Gopaul in regards to 23 the allegations made against him. 24 What was the defendant doing when you went back 25 into the interview room?

	Shulman - People - direct 106
1	A. He was sitting in a chair facing the table in the
2	room.
3	Q. Did you sit down at the table?
4	A. Yes, I did.
5	Q. What happened?
6	A. I sat down across from Mr. Gopaul, the first chai
7	when you walk in the room again. I indicated to him that
8	his step daughter, Sana Awan, had made some allegations
9	against him that there was some activity of an inappropriate
10	nature and if he wanted to talk to me about it.
11	Q. Did you give the defendant the details of the
12	allegation?
13	A. I did not.
14	Q. Did you advise him that it was of a sexual nature
15	THE WITNESS: If I could just refer to my
16	complaint follow-up again, your Honor?
17	THE COURT: Yes.
18	MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, please note my
19	objection.
20	THE COURT: I will note your objection. He
21	can look at it.
22	Go ahead.
23	A. Okay, I believe my words were that the allegation
24	was he was acting inappropriately towards her and that I was
25	not going to tell him exactly what the allegation was, but

Shulman - People - direct

that I would give him an opportunity to discuss things if he

wanted to.

- Q. Did you actually tell him you were not going to give him the details of the allegation?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. What was his response to that?
 - A. That he would like to say something about it.
- Q. What did you do after the defendant told you he wanted to say something about it?
- A. Again, I'm just referring to my notes again here in the complaint follow-up.

MR. SCHECHTER: Excuse me, your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt, however I'm constrained to object simply because the officer is not testifying from memory.

What he is doing is parroting information he plugged into a document almost a year ago, so he's really not testifying, all he's doing is reading from a document not in evidence, can't be in evidence and he's only reading from -- this is not his testimony, this is his document.

THE COURT: Ms. Johnson, would you like to ask the officer some questions with regard to the document?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

Shulman - People - direct

Q. Detective, you can not read from a document not in evidence.

If you wish to refresh your memory you must say so and once you're done refreshing your memory with your notes please look up and don't read from any documents. You must testify as to what your recollection is after having your memory refreshed.

When you went back into the room what did you do after the defendant indicated he wanted to talk to you?

A. He said something of the nature he felt bad about it and he wanted to make a statement.

I then gave him a note pad and a pen and again said, "Here," you know, "if you could right write your name, address, the date and time and you could write your statement."

- Q. Similar to the notepad you had given to him before?
- A. I believe it was the same notepad, but the previous statement had been removed from the top of the notepad.
 - Q. Were the pages blank?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. What did you say to the defendant when you gave him the pad and the pen?
 - A. Something of the effect of, "If you could write

Shulman - People - direct 109 your name, address and phone number and the date and time on 1 the top and then write," you know, "your statement in your 2 words as to what you want to say about this." 3 MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I'm going to ask 4 5 that this be marked as People's Exhibit 5 for identification purposes? 6 THE COURT: People's 5. 8 (People's Exhibit 5 marked for identification.) 9 MS. JOHNSON: Can I have People's 4 back? 10 (Shown to counsel.) 11 Detective, if you could take a look at People's 5 12 Q. for identification purposes? 13 14 Do you recognize that? 15 Α. I do. 16 What do you recognize it to be? Q. 17 Α. It is a photocopy of a statement written by 18 Mr. Gopaul. 19 How do you know that? Q. 20 A. I observed it being written and after its 21 completion I did sign my name and placed my shield number 22 and I did note the date and time on the bottom of said statement. 23 24 Is that a fair and accurate copy of the original 25 that was taken on June 24th, 2008?

Shulman - People - direct 110 Yes. Α. 1 MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, we would offer 2 People's 5 in evidence for purposes of the hearing. 3 MR. SCHECHTER: Voir dire, your Honor? 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MR. SCHECHTER: 8 Ο. I redirect your attention to your grand jury testimony, detective, where you indicated at Page 66 that 9 10 there was some scribble written on the original that was not 11 on the copy. Would you please show us where the scribble that's 12 13 written on the original that's not on the copy, then? And, again, that's not -- I don't believe that's 14 15 pertinent to this particular one page. 16 THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this. 17 THE WITNESS: There is another page, your 18 Honor, that Ms. Johnson has not introduced yet. 19 THE COURT: But it's not People's 5? 20 THE WITNESS: It's not that page right there. 21 MR. SCHECHTER: Okay. May I have the paper, 22 please? 23 (Shown to counsel.) 24 Officer, on this copy there seems to be something 25 written on the very top above Harold Gopaul's name.

·	Shulman - People - direct 111			
1	Could you please tell the Court what, if any			
2	what that is?			
3	It's on the copy.			
4	MS. JOHNSON: I think it's the staple when I			
5	Xeroxed it.			
6	(Shown to witness.)			
7	A. It looks like a staple loop.			
8	Q. Do you see the original?			
9	Do you have the original there?			
10	A. Yes, I have the original.			
11	Q. Could you please look at the original and let me			
12	know if that's on there?			
13	A. It's not on the original. It's either a flaw in			
14	the photocopy or the copier this was copied from had a			
15	staple in it.			
16	MR. SCHECHTER: May I see the original,			
17	please?			
18	THE COURT: Yes.			
19	(Shown to counsel.)			
20	MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you.			
21	No more questions, Judge.			
22	THE COURT: Any objection?			
23	MR. SCHECHTER: Not for the purposes of the			
24	hearing.			
25	THE COURT: All right, so we'll receive			

Shulman - People - direct 112 People's 5 in evidence. 1 (People's Exhibit 5 received in evidence.) 2 MS. JOHNSON: If I could have it shown to the 3 witness, please? 4 5 (Shown to witness.) 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION CONT'D BY MS. JOHNSON: 7 8 Ο. Detective, if you could take a look at People's 5 9 in evidence? Whose handwriting appears on that document? 10 With the exception of my signature and shield and 11 date and time across the bottom, Mr. Gopaul's handwriting is 12 affixed on this paper. 13 14 On the top right-hand side where it says the date Q. and time, who provided that information? 15 16 Α. Mr. Gopaul. 17 Did you observe him write this statement? Q. 18 Α. Yes, I did. 19 Was this after you had issued Miranda warnings to Q. 20 him? 21 Yes, it was. Α. 22 Q. And at this time was your gun still secured? 23 Α. Yes, it was. 24 Ο. Was this after the defendant went to the bathroom? 25 Yes, it was. Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q.

Shulman - People - direct 113 Was any physical force used on the defendant prior to him writing this statement? No, it was not. Α. Were any threats made to the defendant prior to him writing this statement? No, there were not. Did you ask the defendant if he wanted to make any changes to the statement? Upon his completion of writing the statement I asked him to read it over to himself and make sure it was what he wanted to say and if there were any changes he wanted to make he was able to. THE COURT: Does that mean he did make changes or he didn't make changes? THE WITNESS: He didn't make changes, but he was afforded an opportunity if he wanted to. Did you observe him reread the statement? Q. Α. Yes, I did. Did you observe him sign it? Ο. Yes, I did. Α. And the June 24th, 2008 at 8:30 hours, what does Q. that indicate? Α. That was the time I was signing it as this particular statement was complete.

Was that after you observed the defendant read the

	Shulman - People - direct 114			
1	statement over?			
2	A. Yes, it was.			
3	Q. Was that after you asked him if he wanted to make			
4	any changes?			
5	A. Yes.			
6	Q. At any time while he was writing the statement did			
7	he ask to speak to an attorney?			
8	A. No, he did not.			
9	Q. At any time did he indicate he no longer wished to			
10	speak to you?			
11	A. No, he did not.			
12	Q. Was the defendant cooperative with you at this			
13	time in the interview room?			
14	A. Yes, he was.			
15	Q. Did he ask to go to the bathroom while he was			
16	signing this?			
17	A. No, he did not.			
18	MS. JOHNSON: I can take back People's 5.			
19	(Shown to counsel.)			
20	Q. After you affixed your signature to the bottom of			
21	that document was that the end of your conversation with the			
22	defendant?			
23	A. No, it was not.			
24	Q. What happened next?			
25	A. Immediately after I signed the document and dated			

Shulman - People - direct 115 and timed on the bottom I asked him if he had any vibrators 1 in his car. 2 Did you memorialize that conversation in any way? Ο. 3 After the question was answered. 4 Can you walk us through how that conversation 5 Q. 6 happened? Right after I finished that other written 7 Α. statement I asked him if he had any vibrators in the car. 8 I believe he said that he had some vibrators in 9 10 his house and that he had a body massager in his car that was, you know, for himself, but that he had never -- hadn't 11 used it on his daughter. 12 1.3 What did you do after this conversation? I took off the previous statement off the notepad 14 and I had another notepad. I wrote the date and time that I 15 was asking the question. I then memorialized the question I 16 had asked him and the answer he had given in reply. 17 18 MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I'll ask that this be marked as People's Exhibit 6 for identification. 19 20 THE COURT: People's 6. 21 (People's Exhibit 6 marked for 22 identification.) MS. JOHNSON: If I could have that shown to 23 24 the witness, please? 25 (Shown to witness.)

	Shulman - People - direct			
1	Q. Detective Shulman, take a look at People's 6 for			
2	identification purposes, please.			
3	Do you recognize that?			
4	A. Yes, I do.			
5	Q. What do you recognize it to be?			
6	A. It is the a photocopy of the question and			
7	answers that I memorialized when I was speaking to			
8	Mr. Gopaul on June 24th of 2008.			
9	Q. How do you know that?			
LO	A. It's in my handwriting and my signature appears or			
L1	the bottom as I had placed it.			
12	Q. And is that a fair and accurate copy of the			
L3	original?			
4	A. I mean, other than the confidential stamp that I'r			
L5	assuming that somebody in the DA's Office or somebody must			
16	have			
L7	MR. SCHECHTER: Objection to what the officer			
18	assumes, please.			
19	Q. Do you have the original with you, detective?			
20	A. Yes, I do.			
21	Q. If you could just take that out of your case			
22	jacket, please?			
23	MS. JOHNSON: I'll have that marked as			
24	People's 6A.			
25	THE COURT: Fine.			

Shulman - People - direct 117 MS. JOHNSON: For the hearing. 1 MR. SCHECHTER: What is 6A, now? 2 MS. JOHNSON: The original. 3 THE COURT: It's the original without the 4 5 stamp on it. (People's Exhibit 6A marked for 6 7 identification.) Detective, if you could take a look at People's 6 8 9 and 6A for identification purposes? (Shown to witness.) 10 Is People's 6 a fair and accurate copy other than 11 Q. the stamp from the original 6A that you just took from your 12 case jacket? 13 14 Yes, it is. Is there anything missing from the Xerox copy that 15 is on the original? 16 17 Α. No. 18 Or vice versa, other than the stamp? Q. 19 Α. No. 20 Q. Are there any scribbles on that page that counsel is referring to before? 21 22 Yes, there is. Α. 23 And is that on the original or on the copy? 0. 24 It is on the original. Α. 25 Q. Is it on the copy?

Shulman - People - direct 118 It is on this particular copy, yes. 1 Α. And so it's a fair and accurate copy other than Q. 2 the stamp? 3 Α. Yes. 4 MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, we would ask that 5 6 People's 6 be marked into evidence for purposes of the 7 hearing. THE COURT: And that's the copy? 8 9 MS. JOHNSON: The copy, Judge. MR. SCHECHTER: Voir dire, if I may, Judge? 10 11 THE COURT: Yes. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 12 13 BY MR. SCHECHTER: 14 Officer do you not recall testifying a short time 15 ago that every time I asked you a question concerning the 16 scribbles on the original that were not on the copy you had stated there were other papers that -- other statements that 17 18 were made that had not yet been shown to you? 19 Do you recall that question and your answer? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Now you tell us that you -- you testified in the Q. grand jury that there was scribble on the original, but not 22 23 on the copy -- I'm sorry -- what are you referring to? 24 What scribble is not on the original that's on the 25 copy?

A. I don't know the specific context of that testimony, but I believe on the lower portion of this, I guess it's number 6A, and 6, that there's a Q with a couple of lines through it, that after I had completed my questioning of Mr. Gopaul and had signed it, that subsequent to that is when that Q and the dash had gotten written.

MR. SCHECHTER: I respectfully object to this exhibit. I don't think this exhibit is in the same condition at the time it was made.

THE COURT: And the basis for that is?

MR. SCHECHTER: Basis is his grand jury

testimony where he indicated that there is, and I'll

quote it, Judge, "I think there's a little scribble

that just happened to get written on the paper of the

original that's not on the copy."

I can show you the grand jury testimony if the Court wishes.

THE COURT: I have the grand jury testimony.

MR. SCHECHTER: Now the officer testifies, in fact, that it's on both.

What is he referring to?

THE WITNESS: I mean, if I could, your Honor?

MR. SCHECHTER: He said it's not on the first statement, it's not on the second statement.

Now we got the third and it's not on there.

Shulman - People - direct 120 THE COURT: All right, do you have any 1 questions, Ms. Johnson, of the detective? 2 MS. JOHNSON: I'm not done with the 3 4 statement. THE COURT: Okay. 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION CONT'D 7 BY MS. JOHNSON: Detective, that scribble, the Q that's indicated 8 9 on that document, does that appear on your original copy? 10 Α. Yes. 11 Your original? Ο. 12 Α. Yes. Can you tell us when that was put on the piece of 13 Ο. 14 paper? 15 Subsequent to my completion of my interview with Α. 16 Mr. Gopaul while I was still in my office that day. 17 Q. And what was the reason or why did you put that Q 18 on the piece of paper? 19 I don't know specifically. I mean -- can I say 20 what I believe I was thinking at the time? 21 MR. SCHECHTER: Objection. THE COURT: Yeah, if you don't know exactly 22 23 why it was there, just tell us that. 24 Α. I don't recall specifically why it's there. 25 Q. Was this Q on the bottom of the page marked on

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

picture is of, who wrote that?

I wrote that.

Α.

Shulman - People - direct 121 that piece of paper while you were in the interview room or after? MR. SCHECHTER: Objection, it's been asked and answered. The officer already testified when he put that on the paper, after the interview. THE COURT: I'll allow it. You can answer that. Α. After the interview was completed. While in the room with the defendant or after? Q. I don't recall, specifically. Α. Q. Does the top of the page on top of that scribbled Q, is that part of your -- of what's marked as People's Exhibit 6 and 6A, is that a fair and accurate copy of your memorialization of your interview with the defendant? Α. Absolutely. And which part of People's 6 or 6A was written by you and which part was written by the defendant? There's a drawing that Mr. Gopaul drew of what he Α. was describing as the vibrators that he was saying was in his house, that is in his handwriting, and other than his signature, the rest of the statement is in my handwriting. Under the picture where it narrates what the Q.

Shulman - People - direct 122 Was that in the defendant's presence? Q. 1 Yes, it was. 2 Did you show that to the defendant after you wrote 3 4 what the narrative of that picture is? 5 Yes, I did. Α. 6 And did you show the defendant the question and 7 answer that appeared on that document? 8 Α. Yes, I did. And when you showed it to him did he sign 9 10 People's 6 or 6A? 11 He indicated to me that it was accurate as to the Α. question I had asked him and what his answer was and to what 12 13 he had drawn and what I was labelling as his drawing and then he affixed his signature as him saying it was accurate. 14 15 And did he indicate he wanted to make any changes to either the question, answer or the picture? 16 17 Α. No, he did not. 18 Ο. And did you watch him sign it? 19 Α. Yes, I did. 20 Did you explain to the defendant how to draw the Ο. 21 picture? 22 Α. No, I did not. 23 What did you say to him? Q. 24 He made a comment about having vibrators in the 25 house and I think I said something, "Well, can you describe

Shulman - People - direct 123 what it looked like?" 1 2 And I think he said something similar to, "It will 3 be easier if I just draw it for you." MR. SCHECHTER: Objection to what the officer 4 5 thinks. б THE COURT: Yeah, if you don't know exactly 7 what it is that he said just tell us that. THE WITNESS: In sum and substance. 8 9 I don't know verbatim, but it was very similar to that which is what prompted me to give him the paper and pen 10 and say, "If you want to draw it you can draw it." 11 12 And everything that appears above your signature Q. 13 and above the defendant's signature, was that all memorialized in the defendant's presence? 14 15 Yes, it was. 16 Q. And was that all in the -- memorialized in the interview room? 17 18 Α. Yes, it was. 19 MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, for purposes of the 20 hearing we would ask to offer that part of the statement into evidence as that is the fair and 21 22 accurate copy as the detective testified. 23 MR. SCHECHTER: I'm still objecting, Judge, 24 on the grounds that it was altered upon the signature. 25 THE COURT: No, I'll -- I'm going to allow

Shulman - People - direct 124 the entire statement over objection in evidence, 1 2 People's 6. MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, would the Court 3 please note that my objection to the offer of this 4 5 material is continuous even throughout the trial, 6 rather than my making continual objections to it? THE COURT: Yes. 7 8 MR. SCHECHTER: Thank you, Judge. 9 (People's Exhibit 6 received in evidence.) 10 THE COURT: You're not offering 6A in? 11 MS. JOHNSON: No. 12 MR. SCHECHTER: 6 is in evidence? 13 THE COURT: Yes, that's the copy. 14 MR. SCHECHTER: 6A is not. 15 MS. JOHNSON: Can the detective leave that in 16 his case jacket or is the Court going to need it? 17 It's marked for ID. 18 THE COURT: No, it's not being offered at 19 this time. He can leave it in his case jacket. 20 Detective, who wrote the date and time on People's 6 on the top right-hand corner of the document? 21 22 I did. I wrote that. Α. 23 And is that your handwriting, the question and the Q. 24 answer? 25 Yes, it is. Α.

Shulman - People - direct 125 THE COURT: Just if I could interrupt, 1 detective, just with regard to if you could take out 6A 2 again and compare it to 6? 3 Is 6A a photocopy of 6? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Is there anything on 6A or -- I 6 7 should say on 6A that is not on 6, other than the stamp, the confidential stamp? 8 THE WITNESS: No, other than that they're 9 10 accurate. Detective, at any time when defendant was making 11 12 that drawing did he ask to speak to an attorney? 13 No, he did not. 14 Q. And at any time did he indicate he no longer 15 wished to speak with you? No, did he not. 16 Α. 17 Was he still cooperative? Ο. 18 Α. Yes, he was. Was any forced used upon this defendant prior to 19 20 him making that drawing? 21 No, there was not. Α. 22 And were any threats made upon him prior to him Q. 23 making that drawing? 24 Α. No. 25 Was that the end of your contact with the Q.

ر

defendant -- and, I'm sorry, let me just step back.

Had anybody walked in and out of the interview room during this time?

- A. No.
- Q. Was that the end of your contact with the defendant after People's 6 was memorialized?
- A. I believe I interacted with him further during the course of the day, but not of any substantive matter.
 - What did you do next?
 Who did you contact?
- A. At some point in time I spoke to Police

 Officer Alfaro. I indicated to her what the -- what the statements Mr. Gopaul had made were.

I indicated to her that I believe there was evidence in his home or his vehicle that were pertinent to the case. I indicated to her that Mr. Gopaul had given me written consent to search both the vehicle that he was a legal custodian of and his home to recover items.

- Q. To your knowledge, was that done?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And was it you or Officer Alfaro that recovered the property in this matter?
- A. Officer Alfaro recovered the evidence in this case.

MR. SCHECHTER: Objection.

	Shulman - People - direct 127		
1	Q. Well, you didn't recover the evidence, right?		
2	A. I was present		
3	THE COURT: Objection sustained.		
4	Go ahead. You got a new question.		
5	Q. Did you recover any evidence in this case?		
6	A. I did not.		
7	Q. Did there come a time when you contacted the		
8	Queens DA's Office?		
9	A. There did.		
LO	Q. Tell us how that happened?		
l1	MR. SCHECHTER: Objection.		
L2	Did he say they did?		
L3	THE WITNESS: I said I did.		
L 4	THE COURT: All right, you contacted the DA's		
L 5	Office.		
L6	Go ahead Ms. Johnson.		
L 7	Q. What was your purpose for contacting the DA's		
8.	Office?		
.9	A. Mr. Gopaul had made statements to me. I had at		
20	some point in time I asked him if he would be willing to		
21	make a videotaped statement with the Queens District		
2	Attorney's Office.		
3	Q. If I could just stop you there for one moment.		
4	Was it before or after the written statements were		
:5	given that you asked Mr. Gopaul if he wanted to make a video		

statement?

- A. After.
- Q. Was it after Miranda warnings had been issued?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Was it after People's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 that have been marked into evidence, was it after that time frame?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Was it in the interview room that that conversation took place?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Can you tell us how that came about?

 What did you actually ask him?
- A. I indicated to Mr. Gopaul that, if he would like, that the Queens District Attorney's Office might be interested in coming and speaking to him and interviewing him on videotape and if that was something that he would be willing to do, that I would called the District Attorney's Office and make an inquiry if he was interested in doing that.
 - Q. What did he say when you asked him that?
- A. He said he would be willing to make a video statement.
- I left the interview room, leaving Mr. Gopaul in the interview room, and I contacted the Queens District $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left$

129

Attorney's Office.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Was a video subsequently made?
- A. Yes, it was.
- Q. Were you present for that?
- A. Yes, I was.
 - Q. Where was the video made?
 - A. In an interview room in my office.
 - Q. In the 105?
 - A. The 105 Precinct detective squad.
- Q. Was it the same room that you were interviewing the defendant in before?
 - A. No, it was not.
 - Q. How come?
- A. The room that's used to make this particular video at the initial time of speaking to the defendant, the victim in this case, Miss Sana Awan, was in that other interview room, so Mr. Gopaul was spoken to in the second interview room.

At the time that we were going to make the video Miss Sana Awan was no longer in that room, I had access to that room, which also has the ability to plug in the video cassette recorders and is a slightly bigger room to allow room for the District Attorney, the defendant, myself and the videographer.

Q. Can you tell us how it came about that the

Shulman - People - direct 130 defendant was brought from the smaller interview room to the 1 video room? I took Mr. Gopaul out of the smaller interview 3 room and walked him to the other interview room and asked 4 him to have a seat in the chair in the room. 5 Q. Was that before or after the DA's -- the Assistant 6 7 District Attorneys and the videographer had arrived at the 8 precinct? Α. 9 After. 10 At any time did the defendant indicate he no longer wished to make a video statement? 11 12 Α. No, he did not. 13 At any time before or when the Queens DAs arrived did he indicate that he wants to speak with an attorney? 14 15 No, he did not. Α. 16 Were any other officers or detectives in the video 17 room prior to the Queens DA's arriving? 18 Α. No, there were not. 19 Was the defendant handcuffed in the video room? Q. 20 No, he was not. 21 What was -- where was the defendant brought in the Ο. 22 room for when the DAs arrived? 23 Was he sitting at the table? 24 MR. SCHECHTER: Objection, multiple question 25 and she's leading, your Honor.

	Shulman - People - direct 131			
1	THE COURT: Yeah, sustained.			
2	Q. What was the defendant's position when the Queen			
3	ADAs arrived?			
4	A. He was sitting in a chair at a table in the			
5	interview room.			
6	Q. Who was in the room?			
7	A. I was in the room and the videographer was in the			
8	room.			
9	Q. Is the videographer a civilian or a police			
LO	officer?			
11	A. I believe in this case it was a police officer.			
L2	MR. SCHECHTER: Objection as to what the			
13	officer believes, again, Judge.			
14	THE COURT: Do you remember, have a			
15	recollection, as to			
L 6	THE WITNESS: I'm pretty sure it was a			
L7 .	detective, your Honor.			
8.	Q. Is it a detective with your precinct?			
L9	A. No.			
0 0	Q. Somebody with the DA's Office?			
21	A. Yes.			
22	Q. Where was your weapon when you went into that			
23	room?			
24	A. It was still secured in my office in my			
25	Q. To your knowledge, did the videographer have any			

	Shulman - People - direct 132		
1	weapons with him?		
2	A. His were also secured upon his arrival prior to		
3	him going into the interview room.		
4	Q. Is that Police Department policy?		
5	A. Yes.		
6	Q. Have you had the opportunity to review that video,		
7	detective, since that date?		
8	A. Yes, I have.		
9	MS. JOHNSON: I'm going to ask that this be		
10	marked as People's Exhibit 7 for identification		
11	purposes.		
12	THE COURT: People's 7.		
13	(People's Exhibit 7 marked for		
14	identification.)		
15	Q. Detective, if you could take a look at People's 7		
16	for ID?		
17	(Shown to witness.)		
18	Q. Do you recognize that tape?		
19	A. Yes, I do.		
20	Q. What do you recognize it to be?		
21	A. It's a videotape that I reviewed that contains a		
22	substance of a video interview with Mr. Gopaul back on		
23	June 24th of 2008.		
24	Q. Is that a fair and accurate copy of the entire		
25	interview with Mr. Gopaul in that room?		

	Shulman - People - direct 133
1	A. Yes.
2	MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I would ask that
3	this be marked into evidence.
4	MR. SCHECHTER: May I have a voir dire?
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6 -	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. SCHECHTER:
8	Q. Detective, is this a copy of the original or is
9	this the original tape that was made?
LO	A. I believe it's a copy.
L1	MR. SCHECHTER: Objection to what he
L2	believes, your Honor.
L3	THE COURT: Do you know for a fact whether
L 4	it's a copy or the original?
L5	THE WITNESS: I didn't take the video, I
L6	didn't operate the camera, so I couldn't say
L 7	specifically.
L8	Q. How do you know that this is a videotape of the
9	interview of Mr. Gopaul?
20	A. I viewed the videotape on two occasions and
21	watched the substance of what's on the tape and it is myself
2	present in a room when Mr. Gopaul is being interviewed by
23	the Queen's District Attorney's Office.
4	Q. But you don't have that that tape is not on for
5	view now, so you don't know if this tape is the interview of

	Shulman - People - direct 134
1	Mr. Gopaul of your own knowledge?
2	A. Well, I believe in October of '08 when I watched
3	the video I believe in the grand jury and prior to that I
4	affixed my signature on the white tape on the side.
5	Q. Is your signature on this tape?
6	A. Yes.
7	MR. SCHECHTER: May I approach the witness,
8	Judge?
9	THE COURT: Yes.
10	Q. Please show us where your signature is on the
11	tape?
12	(Shown to witness.)
13	A. (Indicating).
14	MR. SCHECHTER: Then I have no objection for
15	the purposes of this hearing, Judge.
16	MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, before I play
17	that
18	THE COURT: Mark it.
19	(People's Exhibit 7 received in evidence.)
20	Q. Detective, I'm going to play what's been marked as
21	People's Exhibit 7.
22	Were Miranda warnings issued again on this tape?
23	A. Yes, they were.
24	Q. And was that done in your presence?
25	A. Yes, it was.

135 Shulman - People - direct THE COURT: Are you going to play it now? 1 MS. JOHNSON: I am, Judge, yes. 2 (Witness steps down.) 3 MS. JOHNSON: Can I have a minute, Judge? 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 (Pause in the proceedings.) 6 7 (People's Exhibit 7 published at this time.) (Witness resumes the stand.) 8 9 Q. Detective Shulman, where was the defendant brought at the conclusion of that video? 10 Initially, I believe he stayed in that interview 11 Α. 12 room and at some point in time Officer Alfaro, I believe, 13 brought him downstairs and he was subsequently transported 14 to the Queens Central Booking facility. 15 Was your contact with the defendant over at the 16 end of this video? 17 Α. Pretty much, yes. 18 At any time during the totality of your contact 19 with the defendant on June 24th, 2008 did he ever ask to 20 speak with an attorney? 21 A. No, he did not. 22 Did he ever indicate to you that he did not want Q. 23 to speak with you? 24 Α. No, he did not. 25 Q. Was there ever a language barrier?

	Shulman - People - direct 136			
1	A. No, there was not.			
2	Q. Was there ever any force used upon him in your			
3	presence?			
4	A. No, there was not.			
5	Q. Any threats made upon him?			
6	A. No.			
7	Q. Any promises made of him?			
8	A. No.			
9	Q. I have no other questions of Detective Shulman.			
L 0	MR. SCHECHTER: May I have about five to			
11	seven minutes to look at the Rosario material, Judge?			
12	THE COURT: Actually, you can have a little			
L3	bit longer than that, I have to break by 12:20.			
L 4	So why don't we pick it up at 2:15?			
L5	MR. SCHECHTER: 2:15?			
L 6	Okay.			
l 7	THE COURT: I take it by then you will have			
L 8	had enough time to review the material?			
L 9	MR. SCHECHTER: Yes.			
20	MS. JOHNSON: Can I leave everything here,			
21	Judge?			
22	THE COURT: Yes.			
23	We'll see everybody at 2:15.			
24	(The luncheon recess was taken at this time.)			
25	* * * *			

Proceedings

1 ||

AFTERNOON SESSION

MR. SCHECHTER: I have Pages 2 and 3 of the arrest report -- of the complaint report, but not Page 1 of the complaint report. I would like to know why not.

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, Page 1 of the complaint report is similar to our narrative and our crime reports. It reflects conversations with the victim along with personal information of the victim. It has nothing to do with the Huntley or Mapp.

If the Court would like to see it?

(Shown to Court.)

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Who is, People -- who would CV stand for in this report here?

There's a reference to a TPO, I'm assuming that's time and place of occurrence, CV walked inside?

THE COURT: I mean, it appears,

MS. JOHNSON: Crime victim.

Mr. Schechter, that this Page 1, the narrative portion which is the only portion that is of any significance at least in terms of what's said, essentially is statements that the complainant, crime victim, stated to, I'm assuming, police personnel.

MR. SCHECHTER: Well, if we can mark that a

Proce	edings	

. |

court exhibit?

As long as I get that in Rosario material when she testifies.

THE COURT: Absolutely. I would think you would be absolutely entitled to it.

MS. JOHNSON: I agree.

MR. SCHECHTER: Your Honor, the other thin kg is on the arrest report I have one of three and I have two of three, but I don't have three of three.

THE COURT: Is that the arrest work sheet?

MR. SCHECHTER: Arrest report it says here, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that what was handed over to you this morning?

MR. SCHECHTER: Either this morning or on Friday.

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, there is one page that I showed counsel of a Page 3, it's completely blank, and another page on an arrest report.

I don't have a Page 3 of three. I don't believe one exists. I can have Detective Schulman double check his case jacket. I don't have a three of three. It could have been blank. I have one of three, I have two of three and then when I -- next page I have is the defendant's mugshot.

Proceedings

139

MR. SCHECHTER: It says three pages, Judge --1 that's one of the reasons --2 THE COURT: I'm at somewhat of a disadvantage 3 because it's been awhile since I dealt with Rosario 4 material that gets generated, if you will, by Police 5 Department, so --6 7 MS. JOHNSON: I can double check. He's right outside. 8 THE COURT: Is this the online systems 9 10 arrest? Is that what you're referring to? 11 MR. SCHECHTER: This says omni form system 12 13 arrest. 14 THE COURT: Right. 15 MR. SCHECHTER: On the top is written arrest 16 report, one of three. 17 THE COURT: I see that. 18 MR. SCHECHTER: And the next one also says 19 arrest report on the top and then it has my client's home and cell numbers and then some information 20 21 underneath with Officer Alfaro's information, but it 22 says then three of three which there's no three of 23 three. I just don't know where three of three.

MS. JOHNSON: In fact, at the bottom of

Page 2 it says end of arrest report.

24

25

ws

Proceedings

MR. SCHECHTER: No, your Honor, if you look at the other pages, if you look at the complaint report, what they mean by end of complaint report they mean end of complaint report for that page because in the complaint report there's two of three and three of three and not one of three. One of three we already discussed has the complainants information, but it says on the bottom end of complaint report, so I suppose no one could say something was written below it, but it doesn't mean it's the end of the entire report, apparently. That's why it's confusing.

MS. JOHNSON: The opposite is true for the arrest report. Bottom of Page 1 of the arrest report is information and then the bottom of Page 2 says end of arrest report.

MR. SCHECHTER: Again, same thing with Page 2 and 3 of the complaint report. On the bottom of Page 2 of the complaint report is end of complaint report and the bottom of Page 3 it says end of complaint report.

What I'm saying to you --

THE COURT: Why don't we do this?

Let's get him on the stand. You ask him -present these things to him because otherwise you're
asking me to figure out what this detective may have
generated in the way of Rosario material.

WS